DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 406 845 FL 024 509

TITLE	Investigating Alternative Assessment in Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Arlington County Public Schools, Va.; Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	30 Apr 97
NOTE	189p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education Programs; Elementary Education; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; *Immersion Programs; Instructional Effectiveness; Instructional Improvement; Junior High Schools; Language Research; *Language Tests; Limited English Speaking; Middle Schools; Oral Language; *Spanish; Student Evaluation; Written Language
IDENTIFIERS	*Alternative Assessment; Arlington Public Schools VA; *Two Way Bilingual Education

ABSTRACT

A study investigated alternative methods of assessing student language skills in Arlington County (Virginia) public schools' Spanish/English two-way bilingual partial immersion program, with the objective of improving information for developing more effective teaching. A team of teachers from each participating school worked with researchers to develop, pilot, field-test, and evaluate alternative assessment methods, including oral and written language rubrics in both Spanish and English. In addition, the research team, which included elementary and middle school teachers, a special education teacher, district administrators, and researchers, explored ways in which using alternative assessment methods might inform or otherwise influence instructional practices. The report describes the context of the school system and bilingual education program, chronicles the project, and summarizes results as they relate to specified project goals. Early termination of the project limited assessment of the rubrics' validity. Unanticipated results and their implications for classroom instruction are also noted. Appendices comprising approximately 75% of the report include English and Spanish versions of the rubrics (grades 1-5) and supporting classroom materials and forms. Contains 11 references. (MSE)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED 406 845

Investigating Alternative Assessment In Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Programs

FINAL REPORT

Submitted to the
U.S. Department of Education
Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs
by
Arlington Public Schools and the Center for Applied Linguistics

for the
Bilingual Education: Field-Initiated Research Program
CFDA Number: 84.292.B

April 30, 1997

Arlington Public Schools
Education Center
1426 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22207
703-358-6097

FL024509

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donna Christian

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This field-initiated research project served to create a more coordinated process across schools involved in the Arlington Public Schools Spanish Partial-Immersion Program for assessing student language ability. The project provided alternative assessment instruments in schools that previously were not using any, and enhanced measures in schools where alternative assessment was already being implemented. The information provided by these alternative assessment instruments also illuminated areas of the participants' instruction that needed support so that they could better meet their students' language needs. The collaborative inquiry research approach constituted a coordinated effort to provide all limited English proficient and English proficient immersion students with better educational service and their parents with a better understanding of their children's progress, skills, and abilities. Due to the early termination of this project, however, the direct impact of this project on students and parents could not be assessed. The material products resulting from this project, however, have been and will continue to be widely disseminated to two-way immersion program administrators and staff by the Arlington Public Schools and the Center for Applied Linguistics.

OVERVIEW

The purpose of this research project was to explore alternative assessment of language proficiency in two-way bilingual immersion programs through the use of portfolios and other innovative assessment measures. The project focused on 1) how teachers in two-way bilingual immersion programs could use alternative means to assess oral and written language skills in Spanish and English, and 2) how the use of alternative assessment measures could influence instructional practices. The project was implemented in the belief that the development and use of alternative assessment measures could lead to improvement in the education of limited English proficient students by giving immersion teachers a more complete picture of their students' language abilities and progress in language development. Further, this information could be made available to parents, who would, in turn, benefit from more detailed information about their children's language learning. Finally, this project aimed to develop a standard approach to more authentically assessing the language development of students in the three county elementary schools in which the immersion program operates.

This project was originally awarded a grant for two years, but saw the Year 2 funding eliminated from the federal budget along with all other research projects administered by OBEMLA. The project received a five month no-cost extension through March 1997, but even this provided insufficient time for all of the proposed goals and objectives to be achieved as thoroughly as originally proposed.

The project was a collaborative effort between the Arlington Public Schools (Arlington, VA) and the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL). The research team included teachers from three schools involved in Arlington County's Spanish Partial Immersion Program, a representative from the middle school immersion program, a special education teacher, administrators from the school district office, and researchers from CAL (Appendix 1). A team of teachers from each school worked with researchers on developing, piloting, field-testing, and evaluating alternative means for assessing language ability. As a result of this project, rubrics for oral language and written language assessment in both Spanish and English were developed, piloted, and field-tested (Appendix 2). In addition, the research team explored ways in which using alternative assessment might inform and otherwise influence instructional practices. Teachers from all participating schools had many opportunities to share their assessment strategies, impressions of the effectiveness of the language rubrics, and classroom experiences throughout the brief duration of the project. The information derived from the collaborative process and the rubrics designed have been and will continue to be disseminated to those interested or involved in two-way programs throughout the United States.

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE FOR THE PROJECT

Two major findings have led many educators of limited English proficient students away from teaching language in isolation and toward teaching language through content. These findings are: 1) native language development and academic achievement are not negatively affected as a result of participating in an immersion program (Genesee, 1994), and 2) language is learned best when it is learned in context (Brinton, 1989; Crandall, 1987, Genesee, 1987, Mohan, 1986). Consequently, many two-way immersion programs have adopted a pedagogical approach that makes language the *medium* of instruction rather than the *focus*. As a result, much of the student language development in these programs occurs implicitly—as the students master content, they also learn to use language for specific purposes. Authentic communication occurs in authentic settings, where there is little explicit focus on language itself.

Studies of immersion programs in Canada, however, have shown that progress in language development is not continuous and does not directly correspond to the amount of exposure to the second language the students receive (Genesee, 1994). In these studies, students who received more content-area instruction in the second language early in the program (early immersion) attained the same language proficiency level as those students who had less early exposure (late immersion). Further, Lyster (1994) has observed that, although students in French immersion programs received a great deal of input in their second language through their content courses, their second language competencies tended to continue to be non-native-like with respect to grammatical and sociolinguistic competencies.

To improve students' second language accuracy, some immersion programs have begun to incorporate a more explicit focus on the second language itself (Räsänen, 1994). European immersion models emphasize the explicit teaching of language as a subject along with content instruction in the second language. This has been credited for promoting higher levels of linguistic accuracy in the second language in Europe (Räsänen, 1994). Lightbown (1989) states that programs need to devote systematic attention to the way in which language is used to express meaning and teach content. Swain & Carroll (1987) add that adopting systematic plans for language development will help prevent immersion teachers from adopting strategies that are less than optimal for developing second language proficiency. Genesee (1994) recommends that the *implicit* language instruction which occurs in immersion programs be coupled with an *explicit* focus on language within the academic curriculum.

This project was undertaken in the belief that a focus on language throughout the curriculum in a systematic and coordinated manner can improve second language development and proficiency. Elementary school structure is conducive to such explicit focus on language across the curriculum, since the teachers of content are, in many instances, the same who teach language arts. In the middle school, this approach becomes more difficult to implement, since the content teachers are most often not language arts teachers. For this reason, it was thought that coordination between middle school and elementary teachers on language proficiency issues could prove useful to both elementary and middle school teachers. Feedback from the middle school could help elementary teachers by informing them of the language development areas needing attention for students entering middle school. Middle school teachers, on the other hand, could benefit from participation in elementary school plans for language development by acquiring a more in-depth understanding of the instructional experiences students were receiving before entering middle school.

A second rationale for the project was that standardizing the assessment of oral and written language abilities across all three schools participating in the immersion program would engender a more cohesive and stronger program. Moreover, it would provide the county with similar data on language development from all schools in the program, which the district could then use to assess the program's effectiveness and areas of weakness. Bringing teachers from all three schools together to explore these issues and develop the rubrics would create closer bonds among the three schools. Further it would allow teachers to share with and learn from each other in ways that would not have otherwise occurred.

Prior to the inception of the project in the fall of 1995, formal instruments used in the Arlington Public Schools had provided some useful information about student language ability. However, such information was not complete. Evaluators of the Key School program found that the *Language Assessment Scales* (LAS) test being used had provided useful information on student language ability in the early years, but by third grade most students reached the highest level rating and little further information could be yielded by the test in subsequent years. Further, the *Student Oral Proficiency Rating* (SOPR) scale, which has been used by the Arlington Public Schools, rated oral language ability from the teacher's perspective, but the instrument did not account for or indicate grade-level development and provided information on student's speaking ability alone. Standardized tests, such as the *Iowa Test of Basic Skills* assessed reading and writing, but only in English. Also, as stated above, such tests only gave a limited picture of a student's abilities and did not reflect the learning process the student had undergone nor the breadth of ability the student was capable of (i.e., using language in a variety of ways).

Middle school teachers of English and Spanish language arts had also noticed certain limitations in the language ability of the students who had come out of the elementary school program. These observations mirrored those made of students who have participated in other immersion programs. The Spanish language arts teacher, for instance, had commented that while the immersion students spoke very fluently, their speech was less redundant (morphologically) and less grammatically accurate than the speech of native speakers. The English language arts teacher had observed that some immersion students had more spelling problems and more limited vocabulary in English than students who had not been in immersion.

Researchers from the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) had been conducting a case study of Key Elementary's immersion program for the previous two years, under the auspices of the National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning (an OERI research center). As part of this study, the researchers had observed the students' reading, writing, listening, and speaking abilities at all grade levels. Through interviews with program teachers, the researchers also discerned a need for more strategies for improving accuracy in the oral and written use of language. Further, in the two years prior to this project, the program had adopted a more explicit approach to teaching language arts in Spanish. Consequently, teachers who were accustomed to only teaching language implicitly (through content) had begun to formally teach language arts. During case study interviews, these teachers expressed a need to learn how to assess language proficiency and teach language in more effective ways than through traditional grammar instruction (Christian et.al., 1996).

In this context, then, the current project attempted to explore the use of alternative language assessments to provide teachers, administrators, parents, and students more accurate information on English and Spanish language development. Given the reduction in the time the project was funded, project directors decided to focus on the development of assessments of the productive skills—speaking and writing—only.

PARTICIPANTS

At the time this project began, in late 1995, Arlington County Public Schools (ACPS) consisted of 19 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, and 4 high schools serving a total of 17,031 children. Approximately 40% of students enrolled in Arlington Public Schools were of diverse ethnic backgrounds, with the largest single group being Hispanics, who made up 29.8% of the total student population. The district had 3,203 limited English proficient (LEP) students, or 19% of the total district elementary school population. Many of these students' second language development needs were served through English as a Second Language (ESOL) and High Intensity Language Training (HILT) programs at all educational levels. Students at three schools (listed below) were and are currently involved in two-way bilingual education programs. These programs were educating approximately 600 students in two languages—Spanish and English.

The Spanish Partial Immersion Program in Arlington County operates in three elementary schools: Francis Scott Key, Oakridge, and Abingdon. The program feeds into and continues at one middle school and one high school.

Francis Scott Key Elementary School's immersion program exists in a highly diverse context, both culturally and linguistically, within the school and the community in general. The program began in 1986 and grew out of a desire to combine services to limited English proficient students with foreign language instruction for native English speaking students. The first two-way immersion class consisted of one first grade class of 18 students—half native English speakers and half native Spanish speakers—to be educated half the day in English and half the day in Spanish.

In 1991, ACPS received a Title VII Developmental Bilingual Education grant from the Department of Education to strengthen and expand the Key Elementary School program's capacity to serve a greater number of students, fully develop the curriculum units for all grade levels, improve instructional strategies, and provide increased teacher training. Title VII funds also contributed to the program by adding a half-time Project Specialist, adding a supplemental developmental bilingual education program at the kindergarten level, providing a Spanish language arts summer school component, establishing a Parent Advisory Committee, and offering Spanish language and bilingual literacy classes to increase parent involvement.

In the seven years prior to the inception of the current project, the program had grown to include 10 teachers and 319 students in grades K-5. At the start of the project, over 50% of the school and immersion student population were of non-Anglo background, and 53% of those students were of Hispanic origin. While students from the Key School neighborhood had priority for enrollment in the program, a number of students were bused in from other neighborhoods within the district.

The program is currently involved in integrating some students from the English as a Second Language (ESOL) and High Intensity Language Training (HILT) programs into classes taught in Spanish. The immersion program also serves special education children by including them for instruction in some multi-age classes.

In 1991, the developmental bilingual program in Arlington County expanded to two other schools—Abingdon Elementary and Oakridge Elementary. Since that time, Key Elementary has provided guidance, assistance, and support to the administration and staff at the newer sites. The program was also extended to the middle and high school levels. At the time of this research project, 50 students continued receiving instruction in Spanish and English in grades 6-8 at Williamsburg Middle School. The first class of immersion students is now in 11th grade, continuing their Spanish language education at Washington-Lee High School.

Abingdon Elementary School's immersion program began in 1992 in first grade and has since expanded one grade level per year to fifth grade. At the time of this project, there were two classes at each grade level educating a total of 113 students. Almost 60% of the school's population was non-White, of which 22.2% was of Hispanic origin. Within the immersion program, 40% of the students were designated LEP. The program selected students by parent interest and residency within the school neighborhood. The program attempted to provide a balance of 50% native English speakers and 50% native Spanish speakers in the classrooms.

Oakridge Elementary School's immersion program also began in 1992 in first grade and has since expanded one grade level per year to fifth grade. Currently, there are two classes at each grade level educating a total of 121 students. At the beginning of this project, over 75% of the school's population was non-White, of which 39.9% were of Hispanic origin. Within the program, 30.5% were designated LEP. The program also selected students by parent interest and residency within the school neighborhood and has attempted to provide a balance of 50% native English speakers and 50% native Spanish speakers in the classrooms.

NEEDS ADDRESSED BY THE PROJECT

The Arlington immersion program's goals have always been high academic achievement and bilingual proficiency for all of its students. The program benefited greatly from the three years of Title VII funding which came to an end in 1995. During that time, the goals for expansion of the program, development of curriculum, and improvement of instruction were largely met. While there had been much progress on improving the instruction of content, there was still a need to focus research on the language development process and how best to assess student achievement in this area. In an instructional environment where students have primarily learned the second language through content, it is often difficult for teachers to separate out language knowledge from content knowledge and ability in order to assess the student's language development and ability. Further, teachers felt that the use of a range of assessment tools would give them greater and more detailed information on the abilities of their students, which would, in turn, enable them to provide more constructive assistance to students in their particular areas of need.

This project, then, was to serve the immersion teachers at all schools by allowing them to craft their own assessment measures to be used in a more uniform manner than was being done. Prior to this project, alternative assessment tools, such as portfolios, were used widely at Key Elementary, but were used to a lesser extent by teachers at Abingdon and Oakridge. Moreover, it was often the case that while student portfolios were kept, teachers were not as aware as they could be of what should be included in a portfolio or of the diverse ways in which portfolios could be utilized to improve assessment and instruction. In the absence of assessment measures, such as scoring rubrics, teachers had no consistent means of evaluating the information they had collected in the portfolios.

Finally, as the immersion programs began to realize the need for more explicit focus on language to achieve higher levels of proficiency and accuracy, teachers needed to be aware of the developmental stages of language acquisition, how to best identify students' strengths and weaknesses in the language, and how to adapt language instruction to meet the students' needs. An alternative assessment package such as the one developed through this project was intended to meet these needs.

NARRATIVE OF PROJECT EVENTS

This section describes the process of the research project. It should be kept in mind that the meetings described in this section were preceded and supplemented by many hours of planning and follow-up between the project coordinator and the project specialist.

Initial Meeting: Establishing the Goals

The first project meeting was held on November 21, 1995 at Key Elementary School. Teachers from all participating schools (except Williamsburg) attended and were provided by Project Co-Director (PD) Ullrich with outlines of the project, its goals and objectives, and a timeline.

After introductions of the research team members, a discussion was held of the existing instruments used to assess language proficiency at the participating schools. It was observed that most of the standardized assessments administered in the schools took place at the end of the school year. This, the teachers noted, did not allow them to receive feedback on student progress that could inform their instruction during the academic year. Further, student test results on oral and written proficiency from one year were not provided to the teachers who would have the students the next year. The teachers, then, were not receiving information on the development of student language proficiencies until the end of the school year, if at all.

As a first step toward designing alternative forms of assessment that could be used throughout the year to yield the kind of information the teachers needed, the teachers were provided with frameworks for language objectives for English and Spanish that had been previously developed by Key Elementary staff and Arlington County. Since these objectives were numerous, developing alternative assessment instruments for all of the objectives would be impractical, it was agreed, since it would be too time-consuming to use them to assess each student's abilities in every area. Therefore, the teachers decided it would be beneficial to choose a subset of these objectives for which they would like to develop instruments. The teachers decided to work with peers from their schools in December and January to choose approximately three objectives for oral proficiency and three objectives for written proficiency for their grade level for which they would like to develop assessment instruments. These objectives would be drawn from the county's Immersion Spanish Language Arts framework for language objectives. Gaps would be filled in by other teachers, or at a later date (possibly over the summer) by the research team. As an incentive for enlisting wider support for the project, Project Co-Director Ullrich offered continuing education credits to teachers at the three participating schools who were not participating officially in the project in exchange for their assistance in project work.

Second Meeting: Exploring Assessment and Setting Objectives

The second meeting was held on January 30, 1996 at Key Elementary. The participating teachers were joined at this meeting by: the coordinator of the county's ESOL/HILT program, the Project Co-directors (PDs), the Project Coordinator (Project Coordinator), the Project Specialist (Project Specialist), and the principal of Key School.

To engage the team in thinking about assessment and its place in instruction, the meeting began with a pair of activities meant to elicit discussion about why and how teachers assess. In the first activity, teachers divided into groups of three and were presented with a scenario in which their principal had asked them to give a five minute presentation at a staff development meeting on "Why We Assess." The groups brainstormed ideas about what they would say. The answers included:

- to diagnose student strengths and weaknesses;
- to provide feedback on student learning;

- to provide a basis for instructional placement within the classroom, (e.g., reading groups);
- to inform and guide instruction;
- to provide practice applying knowledge and skills;
- to provide a basis for student evaluation;
- to obtain data for site-based management;
- to gauge program effectiveness; and
- to teach students how to self-assess.

In general, the teachers expressed the need for assessment to provide information to them about student skills and abilities that could be used to improve instruction.

The next activity involved the groups imagining they were in an evening adult Japanese foreign language class, and discussing how they would like to be assessed. The teachers felt strongly that each student's learning style should be ascertained and considered when assessing the student so that assessment tasks could either be tailored to or incorporate different learning styles. Further, when evaluating the results of an assessment, knowing a student's strengths and weaknesses as a learner could provide supplemental information about why that student performed well or not on certain tasks (e.g., why a visual learner performs poorly on the aural aspects of a task).

Other ways the teachers said they would like to be assessed included:

- authentic/performance assessment;
- through assessments tied to student interests;
- assessed in a non-stressful manner;
- assessments of four basic language skills; and
- assessments in areas of strength and weakness.

In general, the teachers seemed to realize the importance of providing multiple forms of assessment in order to receive greater and more varied information about student skills and abilities. Project Co-Director Ullrich then reviewed some of the trends in assessment that the county was attempting to implement. These included:

- integrating reading, writing, speaking, and listening;
- moving away from paper and pencil and into real-world assessment;
- moving away from single-occasion testing and into more broad-based, portfolio assessment to show change over time;
- moving away from single-attribute testing and into using more holistic, multi-dimensional assessment; and
- moving away from exclusive emphasis on individual assessment and moving toward more collaborative assessments (e.g., assessment of group work).

After covering why and how one should assess, a brief discussion was held about for whom the assessment results were intended, in the particular case of the research team in the Arlington Public Schools. The teachers identified the following audiences:

- teachers (themselves);
- students;
- parents;
- grade-level/department team members;
- school administrators;
- curriculum supervisors;
- business community (sponsors);
- general public; and
- special interest groups.

The teachers emphasized the importance of tailoring assessment to the needs of the parents. Parents, they stated, are not only interested in seeing what progress their child is making as an individual, but also how their child is doing relative to his or her peers. It was stated that the forms of assessment developed by the project should be able to provide this type of information for the parents.

At this point, the teachers presented the grade-level objectives for writing and speaking that they had identified during their individual school meetings. Most teachers found it difficult to limit themselves to only three objectives and instead listed numerous ones. The objectives ranged from task-oriented (e.g. tell a story) to skill-oriented (e.g., ask and answer questions) ones. Some were more grade-level specific than others. For example, "recognize and use past tense verb forms" was specific to third grade, but it was also pointed out that such an objective might be inappropriate when considering language development differences for first-language and second-language learners.

This led to a discussion of whether the project should be addressing such differences or concentrating on objectives that would be broad enough to apply to all students, regardless of language dominance. It was decided that it would be too time-consuming to develop separate English language objectives for native English speakers and non-native English speakers, or separate Spanish language objectives for native Spanish speakers and non-native Spanish speakers. If students were evaluated on broad components of writing and speaking, however, the same assessments could be used for both groups. To demonstrate this, Project Coordinator Montone shared several kinds of rubrics with the teachers on overhead transparencies. These and others were also distributed to all teachers in the form of a packet. After examining some of these rubrics, the teachers decided that tying objectives to broad components of the language skill, such as composing, style, and usage for writing, would work well to assess all students. Additionally, it was observed that such a rubric could also provide a means of comparing native and non-native students' development, if an analytic scoring criteria were used (such as a graded scale). If, however, a holistic scoring criteria were adopted, the teachers might only be able to gain information on individual student proficiencies and progress, and not be able to easily make comparisons between different language-dominant groups. The choice between a more analytic or more holistic grading scale was not made at this time. The discussion was postponed until teachers could decide what kind of information (e.g., individual and comparative, or just individual) they wish to gain from the assessments.

The teachers were then presented with other rubrics that included scales covering all levels of proficiency across grades. The teachers agreed that they would rather develop rubrics that were specific to each grade level. At this point, the ESOL/HILT coordinator pointed out that such rubrics had already been written for English, and

Project Co-Director Ullrich announced that Spanish rubrics had also been created, but not yet disseminated. It was agreed that if adequate rubrics existed, they should be used, rather than re-invent the wheel. However, it was also agreed that the existing rubrics could possibly be separated by grade level—since they existed only as a composite covering all grade levels—and adapted so as to include the agreed upon language skill components of speaking and writing.

With regard to the skill components, the teachers agreed to use those writing components employed by Virginia Passport to Literacy, since all students must be able to pass this test in order to graduate from high school. These components were:

- Composing
- Style
- Sentence Formation
- Usage, and
- Mechanics

For the speaking components, they decided to use those employed by the
Student Oral Proficiency Rating (SOPR):

- Comprehension
- Fluency
- Vocabulary
- Pronunciation
- Grammar

The teachers decided to meet with grade-level colleagues on the research team before the next full team meeting in March to determine grade-level objectives for each component for both writing and speaking. Project Specialist Fernández, Project Coordinator Montone, and Project Co-Director Kenyon (when available) would also attend these interim meetings to assist the teachers in writing these specific objectives. It was agreed that the Arlington Public Schools' existing English and Spanish language rubrics would be used to the extent possible to aid in this task.

Finally, dialogue journals were handed out to the teachers with written instructions on how they were to be used to provide the Project Directors, Coordinator, and Specialist with information and insight on the impact the project was having on the teachers. Other readings and resources were also provided to the teachers, related to the topics of assessment in general, alternative assessment, and portfolio assessment.

Crafting the Rubrics

Between the second and third meetings of the research team, grade-level teachers met to write out objectives and skill descriptors for each of the component areas for writing and speaking that were identified during the second meeting. Project Co-Director Kenyon, Project Coordinator Montone, and Project Specialist Fernández worked with these teachers when possible to craft the new rubrics.

The third meeting of the research team was held on March 19. Teachers presented their draft grade-level rubrics for writing and speaking. At this meeting, most of the discussion was related to issues of what and what not to assess.

There was debate as to whether to assess students' "academic" language only or "social" language as well. It was pointed out that research in immersion programs has shown that students tend to develop good levels of proficiency in "academic" language in their second language, but lower levels of "social" language. Questions were raised regarding how to elicit "social" language for the purposes of evaluation. It was decided that the rubrics would be able to assess students' ability to use language in both social and academic contexts with the understanding that whatever tasks were used to elicit the language to be assessed would have to provide opportunities for the student to demonstrate both social and academic language abilities (or it was to be noted which type of language the task elicited).

Teachers also debated whether to include pronunciation as a component area in the oral rubric. After some discussion it was decided not to include pronunciation for the following reasons:

1) the developmental nature of two-way immersion does not necessitate teaching pronunciation, since it develops naturally in young children;

2) in such programs, teachers rarely teach pronunciation explicitly, and therefore should not assess pronunciation formally;

3) little information is gained by assessing pronunciation; and

4) in many two-way immersion programs, the focus is on ability to communicate meaning rather than on form.

It was further agreed that if a teacher wanted to note observations about a student's pronunciation, s/he could do so in the "Comments" area of the "Fluency" component section.

Additionally, in the area of writing, it was decided that the "Style" component should be omitted from the first grade rubric since it was felt students at that grade level should not reasonably be expected to incorporate style into their writing.

Also at this meeting, several scoring options were presented for discussion, such as numerical or letter-based. It was decided that a numerical system would be developed, which could be used for each component area and that would be anchored to the grade-level objective for that component.

Finally, it was noted that the rubrics should be checked across grade levels and component areas for consistency. Interesting questions and comments from teacher journal entries were also presented and discussed.

Fourth Meeting: Revising the Rubrics, Preparing for Piloting

The April meeting focused on further revision of the rubrics, scoring options, and planning for collection of student language samples to use for piloting the rubrics.

After making further revisions to the rubrics, based on continued review for consistency, appropriateness, and practicality, the team revisited the issue of scoring options. A scale of 1-5 was agreed upon, with level 3 representing the end-of-year expectation the teachers had for their students' abilities at each grade level (Appendix 3). Below level 3, a "1" indicates that the student does not approximate the end-of-year expectation, and a "2" indicates that the student approximates the end-of-year expectation. Above level 3, a "4" indicates work exceeding the end-of-year expectation, while a "5" indicates work *far* exceeding the grade level expectation. It was agreed that scoring with these numbers would not be required, but would be an option for those teachers who might want to have a quick visual reference of their students' proficiency levels.

The team then turned its attention to the criteria for selecting tasks that would be appropriate for eliciting enough oral and written language to enable the rubrics to be utilized fully and effectively. Teachers were given a matrix with each skill component listed for either writing or speaking (Appendix 4). The teachers brainstormed tasks that students could undertake that would yield information for each component area. If the task did not permit a student to demonstrate his/her ability in every component area, the task could not be included. Teachers also had to indicate whether a task elicited social language, academic language, or both, since the rubrics measured student ability in both areas.

Fifth Meeting: Final Preparation for Piloting

For the May meeting, teachers met for a full day to revise and finalize translations of the writing rubrics prior to piloting, to review and revise the instructions for the rubrics (Appendix 5), to develop oral and written elicitation tasks (Appendix 6), and to plan for the summer session and the field-testing that would take place in the fall. During this meeting, the development of a class matrix was proposed (Appendix 7), so teachers could see all their students' scores at a glance.

Summer Work: Elicitation Tasks and Field-Testing the Writing Rubrics

The intensive summer session took place from June 24-28 with a core of four teachers, the Project Specialist, Project Coordinator, and occasional visits by Project Co-Director Kenyon. The nuclear research team met every day from 9 am to 3 pm. During this week, all project products were reviewed once again. English and Spanish language rubrics were reviewed for glaring errors or inconsistencies. The class matrix proposed in the May meeting was developed by the Project Coordinator and presented to the teachers for their comments. The writing rubrics for all grades were field-tested with samples of student writing taken from the spring county writing assessment. As a result of the field-testing, many revisions were proposed to the writing rubrics. In addition, the Project Specialist proposed collecting oral language samples from among the summer school students that could be used for similar field-testing of the oral rubrics in the fall. Also during this week, grade-level oral and written elicitation tasks were designed. However, it was felt that when field-testing the oral rubrics, it would be helpful to use a uniform instrument for eliciting appropriate and sufficient language from students. To this end, a unique elicitation instrument was created to collect oral language samples in a uniform manner from the summer school students (Appendix 8). Toward the end of the week, the Project Specialist led discussion of other assessment issues, such as the use of language arts portfolios and a new county report card that would incorporate multiple forms of assessment.

Piloting and Field-Testing the Rubrics

At the start of the new school year in September, the project was informed that, despite the Congressional elimination of funding for the project, a five month no-cost extension was granted.

Also at this time, Arlington Public Schools Foreign Language Department decided to have all teachers in the immersion program at all three elementary schools use the writing rubrics for the Fall county-wide assessment of writing in October. A rater training session was conducted by the Project Coordinator and Project Specialist for teachers from all three schools. The next day a research team meeting was held to field-test the oral rubric with the audiotaped language samples the Project Specialist had collected over the summer. Teachers listened to speech samples of students at all grade levels in English and Spanish and used the oral rubrics to score them. As a result, changes in the oral rubrics were suggested and implemented prior to having the teachers pilot them with their students in October.

In the first week of October, the teachers collected writing samples and scored them using the rubrics. Each teacher served as the first rater, scoring her own students' writing. In November, the research team met for the purpose of conducting a second rating of the students' writing, in order to monitor the teachers' rating reliability. For this activity, a subset of the first rated writings were selected by the Project Coordinator and given to each teacher. No teacher received her own students' writing samples for the second rating. Due to some ratings being incomplete and others not being turned in, this second rating procedure and subsequent analysis was extended throughout the fall.

Due to the many tasks being asked of the teachers in October, the field-tesing of the oral rubrics was postponed until November. During the November research team meeting, the oral rubrics were reviewed and more changes were suggested. Later in November, the project teachers used the oral language elicitation instrument developed over the summer to pilot the oral rubrics. Each project teacher pulled individual students out of the class for about ten minutes, elicited the student's speech, and then used the oral rubric to assess the speech sample before assessing the next student. In each case, the Project Specialist attended and served as the second rater. Analysis of the rater reliability was conducted in the winter of 1997.

Classroom Visits and Instructional Impact

During November the Project Coordinator and Project Specialist visited project teacher classrooms at Key and Abingdon to experience the teachers' local settings and instructional contexts. Due to the premature ending of the project, more classroom visits for this purpose as well as to form basis for suggesting ways in which the rubrics could be integrated more into instruction could not be undertaken. Neither could the planned teacher visits to one another's classrooms.

Meetings in January and February gave teachers the opportunity to discuss assessment practices more in depth. During these meetings, teachers shared their experiences using the rubrics and the impact the project has had on their awareness of the students' language abilities and their own (and the district's) assessment and instruction practices. The teachers also continued to review and revise the rubrics, and revised the classroom matrix and introduction to the rubrics. The Project Specialist also continued to revise the Spanish rubrics and completed the translation of the introduction to the rubrics during this period.

Final Touches and Continuation

A final project meeting was held on March 17 during which the teachers reviewed all project products one more time prior to completion of the final report and widespread dissemination of the products. Project Co-Director Kenyon presented his analysis of the reliability of the writing and speaking ratings undertaken in the fall. (See Appendix 9 for a more detailed analysis.) During this meeting, final revisions were made to the rubrics.

Later in April, the teachers reviewed and commented on a draft of the final report, which was written by the Project Specialist, Project Coordinator, and Project Co-Director Kenyon. Although the formal project was brought to a close, Arlington Public Schools remains dedicated to continuing work on the rubrics. The Spanish language rubrics that were developed by the project have provided the county with its only instruments for measuring student progress in speaking Spanish, and for having grade-level objectives for speaking and writing in Spanish. For this reason, there is strong incentive for the county to continue using these rubrics.

MEETING THE NEEDS

Through a collaborative research approach, teachers, administrators, and researchers worked together to meet the immersion program's need to evaluate extant assessment instruments and determine what information these instruments were providing, what further information about student language development would be useful to obtain, and what other assessment tools and measures could be used to provide such information. During period of the grant, teacher/researchers developed and field-tested an assessment tool that would meet the program's needs and fit into the program's larger portfolio assessment plan.

Over the course of the 17 months of the project, the research team designed scoring rubrics for speaking and writing in Spanish and English that were consistent with the immersion program's and the district's language development objectives. Through the field-test process, the research team observed the efficacy of the language rubrics as measures for assessment, making numerous revisions. The research team compiled data from the use of rubrics to determine their validity and reliability as well as practical aspects related to their use in the classroom.

In addition, regular teacher/researcher reflection on experiences utilizing the rubrics revealed that teachers, as a result of this project, had begun to focus more on the language development of the students. These impressions were recorded in dialogue journals, by which means the participants communicated their questions, concerns, and insights to the project coordinators. Information from the journals were shared and discussed during meetings of the research team throughout the year. These discussions provided the teacher/researchers with valuable opportunities to share insights, successes, and failures with their colleagues so that they could improve on their assessment procedures and suggest new instructional strategies and techniques.

The participation of CAL researchers assisted the program in a number of ways. CAL researchers were very familiar with the Arlington immersion program, having provided it with guidance, assistance, and evaluation since the program's inception in 1986. This familiarity with the program allowed CAL researchers to help guide the teacher/researchers in crafting assessment measures that would meet their program's unique needs. CAL's knowledge and experience in the field of linguistics, language development, and language testing were used to help teachers identify the language needs of the students, develop and field-test, and evaluate the rubrics.

GOALS ACHIEVED

The following are the goals and objectives of the project as laid out in the original project proposal. It should be remembered that these goals were written for a proposed three-year project. The original project was cut back to two-years after review by OBEMLA. As mentioned above, it was funded for only one year. ACPS and CAL were given a five-month no cost extension, which meant the duration of the project was 17 months, less than half the time envisioned when these goals were originally written. Nevertheless, through the hard work the project team met these goals and most of the objectives.

GOAL ONE

Develop sets of language objectives by grade level for a two-way immersion program.

Objective 1.1. Increase the research team's awareness of the spectrum of abilities and skills underlying language proficiency and communicative competence in general.

Objective 1.2. Determine overarching, general objectives for the language goals of the two-way program appropriate to each grade focused on in the study.

Objective 1.3. Examine the implications of such objectives for instructional practice.

Objective 1.4. Develop and adopt general language rubrics as part of an ongoing process informed by insights from the assessment and instructional components of the research effort.

RESULTS FOR GOAL ONE:

GENERAL: The project integrated the grade-level objectives of the ACPS and Key School Spanish and English language curriculum frameworks into the assessment rubrics. In doing so, language objectives have become fully incorporated into assessment.

Objective 1.1. Through discussion at large group meetings, grade-level meetings, and between the Project Specialist and teachers, the teaching members of the research team became more fully aware of issues in language proficiency and communicative competence. In addition, the Project Specialist and Project Coordinator provided many pertinent outside readings to the teachers on the topic. An increased awareness and sensitivity to these issues was present in the teachers' discussion and also in the journals they kept. Teachers have gained a better understanding of assessment by reading and sharing articles, and other research and references that support the use of alternative assessment. Teachers now suggest strategies and changes in instructional practices that include:

- more conversational opportunities to improve fluency;
- more emphasis and opportunities for writing; and
- awareness that teachers need to give students more time and to help them develop oral language skills.

Objective 1.2. This objective was met as the teachers selected grade-level language objectives as the core of the rubrics and then further discussed and refined them together as the rubrics were drafted, revised, piloted, and field-tested. Examining the application of the rubrics to actual oral and written samples helped teachers gain more insight into the appropriate language objectives for each grade. Thus, the process of developing the scoring rubrics encouraged teachers at all grade levels to focus more specifically on the language abilities of their students. With the help of some assessment instruments already being utilized in the district (e.g., for the ESOL/HILT Program, and the state literacy requirements for graduation from high school), the research team identified grade-level objectives for component areas in speaking and writing in both English and Spanish. The language objectives for Spanish constituted the first time the district has had such objectives, filling a gap in the curriculum design.

The project also required teachers to focus on the process of language development over time and across grades. Teachers reviewed and revised the rubrics many times, striving to make them consistent across grades and to demonstrate progressive and realistic advancement in proficiency from one year to the next within every skill component area. As a result, the immersion teachers now have a more complete picture of what their students' abilities are and should be and a means to measure their progress in language skill development on an ongoing basis.

Objective 1.3. The teachers involved in the project reflected on how their instruction might improve as a result of having explicit language objectives. The teachers have expressed their opinion that having clear language objectives will give them uniform guidelines to follow and that there will be more consistency across grade levels. One teacher remarked, "I think my analysis is less subjective because I have guidelines to follow. I also have a clearer set of expectations for each grade level." In the future, as teachers internalize these objectives, they expect them to have a greater impact on the delivery of their instruction. As the same teacher added, "I have not yet internalized the objectives. I think that with more frequent use, I will be more comfortable with them, and I will incorporate them into my assessment."

During the process of developing the rubrics, the research team teachers had opportunities to talk and debate over how to apply rubric-based criteria to actual students' performances, and they recognized that they would have to struggle to find time to do a more in-depth evaluation of their students. Overall, the teachers found that oral and writing rubrics provide them with the following:

- guidelines, thus making the observation of students' learning less subjective;

- a clear set of expectations for each grade level;
- information to report students' progress to parents at conferences; and
- a means to help determine grades for report cards.

Some teachers have used the rubrics during parent/teacher conferences to report on student progress. These parents stated that it was very helpful to have a set of objectives on hand in order to be able to talk about the progress of their child.

Objective 1.4. In electing to use the writing rubrics developed by the project to score state-mandated assessments during the fall and spring of the 1996-97 school year, ACPS has demonstrated that this objective has been reached. While there is no mandated oral testing, we expect that there will be a widespread use of the oral rubrics in the county's immersion programs as well. Thus, as a direct result of this project, the Arlington immersion program now has a more complete assessment process for meeting the language development goals they have for their students. There is now a more uniform and informative assessment of student language abilities across program sites.

GOAL TWO

Develop assessment procedures appropriate to the two-way immersion context and that reflect students' linguistic and communicative competence accurately and comprehensively.

Objective 2.1. Explore and assess ways for teachers to receive a more complete view of student language proficiency and communicative competence and to receive a valid picture of students' progress in language learning and use.

Objective 2.2. Examine the compatibility and congruence between forms of assessment and instructional activities that advance the goals of two-way immersion.

Objective 2.3. Field-test assessment procedures for their applicability, validity, and quality of information they yield.

Objective 2.4. Evaluate the alignment of assessment procedures with both language objectives and instructional activities.

Objective 2.5. Critique assessment procedures and their implications for other aspects of the instructional process.

RESULTS FOR GOAL TWO:

GENERAL: The project clearly met this goal for the productive skills of speaking and writing. Rubrics were developed to assess performances on oral and written tasks, and teachers brainstormed lists of grade-level tasks appropriate for assessment (Appendix 6).

Objective 2.1. Through group meetings, grade-level meetings and individual conversations with project personnel, teachers became more focused on assessing language ability than previously. This was reflected in their discussions, journals, and responses on questionnaires. Teachers talked about how they could get a valid picture of their students' language development. They often mentioned that they had not been very focused on it in the past. They thought of creative ways of eliciting spoken and written language performance, and how to use the rubrics developed in the project and creative ways to assess it.

As teachers reflected on the impact that this project has had on their knowledge and views of assessment methods, they realized the changes in their perspectives of assessment. As a result of this project, teachers in the research team have a wider perception of oral and written assessment, and this has had a positive effect in the delivery of their instruction.

In particular, this study has helped teachers to become more aware of their students' *oral* language development and the importance of providing more oral activities so that students can be more actively engaged in the classroom. One teacher noted, "I never concentrated very heavily on oral language until this study. I find oral assessment to be an important part of first-grade instruction." It has also made teachers more conscientious of alternative assessment methods and has caused them to look at students in a developmental manner; that is, as moving along a language continuum.

Objective 2.2. Learning, teaching, and assessment are inextricably linked, and project teachers felt that assessment procedures should derive from existing classroom practices. As the teachers developed performance tasks, they saw this link and opportunities to measure performance with different tools. Thus, designing performance tasks that were in tune with their instructional strategies was an integral part of the curriculum.

Before this study, assessment tried to reflect what was taught, but now teachers use assessment as a tool to tell them what to teach. For example, one teacher remarked, "I try to incorporate assessment by using the information to see what needs to be reviewed and what has been mastered." Teachers now understand the need of integrating assessment and instruction, as assessment helps gather the information that will guide the teacher in providing the instruction that students need, both collectively and individually. For example, if many students were consistently using the improper placement of adjectives, the teacher might plan lessons on specific placement of adjectives to make their writing more effective. The teacher could then observe who successfully applied this skill in his or her writing. It would therefore become a cycle—first, assess by observing students work, then instruct, and then evaluate students' ability to apply the instruction. In this way, teachers intend to use assessment to plan their teaching, and group students of similar levels for instruction, as they conscientiously work to improve specific areas of writing such as composition, grammar, and so forth.

In this way, teachers felt that the rubrics could be used as both formal and informal assessment tools to evaluate oral and writing language development. As a more formal instrument, teachers plan to use the information gathered from the rubrics to report to parents, as part of the student's portfolio, to substantiate students' needs whether it is the gifted learner or the learning-disabled student, and also to help them determine grades for report cards.

Overall, the teachers' own classroom teaching experiences support the research literature's statements that assessment plays a key role in instructional and learning experiences. Including several opportunities for assessment and evaluation in the cycle assures keeping one's instructional goals and objectives "on track." As one teacher pointed out, "I don't see myself using numbers to evaluate my students, but look at what they are doing and what they aren't, according to our criteria of language development." In balance, this was a most useful research project, as it yielded precisely the information needed to help teachers chart a realistic course of action for the students in the two-way bilingual immersion programs in Arlington Public Schools.

Objective 2.3. As described in the report narrative, the rubrics were field-tested in all grade levels for both English and Spanish. (A detailed description of the field testing and the empirical results are presented in Appendix 9.)

Due to the reduction in the length of the project and the inability to examine the rubrics used operationally, it is difficult to address their validity in detail. The notion of validity of an assessment is ultimately related to the use that is made of the scores resulting from the assessment. The main goal of the project was to provide classroom teachers with an integrated approach to curriculum and assessment that would provide them with an additional measure to inform and improve their instruction. Such as classroom-based assessment may be considered "low stakes" on the part of the individual student, as it is primarily intended to inform the teacher and improve instruction. The duration of the project meant that an analysis of the implementation of the rubrics and assessments was not possible. However, teachers involved in the project felt that the rubrics and accompanying assessment provided information useful to their instruction. They felt that there was an alignment between what they more informally see in the class and the results of the assessment. Because of this, they particularly liked the possibility of more formally documenting (as in a portfolio) student work and progress in relation to the grade-level goals using the assessments and rubrics developed in the project. There was a strong feeling that this would be beneficial in communicating progress to parents and students. Thus, they felt that the quality of information yielded by the assessments was high.

The reliability of the assessment, one aspect of its technical quality, is also documented in Appendix 9. In short, the reliability appears acceptable for a classroom assessment. Nevertheless, training in the use of the rubrics with new faculty and those not involved with the project will be necessary.

Objective 2.4. Teachers felt that the rubrics should reflect the language objectives stated in the language arts curriculum and that the strategies and activities used in their instruction should facilitate gaining useful information on students mastering the objectives. As such, it was decided to have grade-level objectives be part of the rubrics. In addition, teachers felt the need to design tasks to match the grade-level objectives indicating when performance of a task was above or below the expectation for that grade level.

Objective 2.5. Through this project, teachers came to a better understanding of the developmental nature of language as a process and that instruction should account for this process. One teacher reflected, "I am now paying attention to language as a tool of communication rather than on language knowledge. I do not spend so much time trying to correct all the errors in a piece of writing."

Another result of this project was that some of the teachers realized that students could also assume responsibility for the evaluation of their work. For example, they could analyze pieces of writing using the rubrics, and with the teacher, determine which aspects of their language instruction required reinforcement. Some of the teachers now feel the need to observe students on a day-by-day basis and make written notes to have records of their students' development.

GOAL THREE

Achieve coordination across schools in the development, implementation, and revision of the project recommendations.

Objective 3.1. Fully utilize the combined resources and expertise of the teachers and school district members of the collaborative research team.

Objective 3.2. Ensure that all three participating schools are appropriately represented and involved in the research process and that each school's particular needs are being met.

Objective 3.3. Develop and implement professional development workshops at the research sites with a view to reaching out to a larger number of practitioners.

RESULTS FOR GOAL THREE:

GENERAL: This goal was achieved in large part by the work of the Project Specialist, Evelyn Fernández. The implementation of the results of the project in ACPS will be largely a result of her continuing efforts.

Objective 3.1. The Project Specialist position was funded through this project at 50% FTE. Arlington Public Schools district office showed its support for the improvement of the immersion program in general and this project in particular by financing the other half of Mrs. Fernández's time, so that she might serve as the county's Immersion Coordinator. Mrs. Fernández was given office space in the district office from which she administered her daily activities. This level of district and project support, along with Mrs. Fernández's many years of experience with the immersion program and her unbridled enthusiasm for it, translated into a high level of activity on her part to achieve coordination across all schools throughout each phase of this project. Under her leadership, the resources and expertise of the teachers and school district members were coordinated and fully utilized.

Objective 3.2. As Project Specialist, Mrs. Fernández maintained almost daily contact with teachers and administrators at each of the three elementary schools, and was the point of contact for the project with the participating middle school teacher. Although each elementary school was not represented equally on the project team—due in part to teacher attrition and partly to already heavy teacher workloads, Mrs. Fernández took pains to encourage teachers from the less represented schools to participate, and personally filled in whatever gaps happened to arise.

Objective 3.3. When the district decided to use the writing rubrics for their countywide assessment in the fall of 1996, the Project Specialist and Project Coordinator provided workshops to train teachers from all three elementary schools in how to use the rubrics for the writing assessment. Unfortunately, because the project was terminated after the first year, more training could not be done. Nevertheless, the district plans to continue training of this nature on its own.

DISSEMINATION AND EXTERNAL IMPACT OF THE PROJECT

In February 1997, the Project Specialist and Project Coordinator attended the annual conference of the National Association for Bilingual Education in Albuquerque, NM. They participated in a pre-conference professional development institute on assessment in two-way immersion education. As part of their presentation, the rubrics for speaking and writing in English and Spanish for all five grade levels were distributed to the over 200 participants. Project Coordinator Montone described the research project and explained the rubrics, while Project Specialist Fernández described how the rubrics would fit into the broader language arts portfolio. The presentation was well-received, and there was great interest in the rubrics.

CAL has and will continue to provide materials (e.g., final language rubrics, Key Elementary's portfolio packet, revised assessment plan) to other two-way immersion programs and interested school districts on request. The Two-Way Immersion project undertaken at CAL for the OERI-funded Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence (CREDE) is planning to use the writing rubrics to show development over several years in student writing ability at all 11 schools participating in the research project. As a result, teachers from each school will be oriented to the rubrics and trained on how to use them. One two-way immersion program in New England has even requested that Project Coordinator Montone conduct a rater training session for all two-way program staff. (This training was scheduled for May 1997.)

Further dissemination has been carried out through such channels such as the ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, the National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers, and conference presentations. Due to the early cut-off in funding, information derived from the project (e.g., guidelines for developing language development alternative assessment tools and rubrics) was not able to be prepared for dissemination prior to the end of the funding period. To the extent that CAL and Arlington Public Schools staff have the time and resources to develop and publish or otherwise disseminate such information, they will do so.

REFERENCES

Brinton, D., Snow, M., & Wesche, M. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House.

Christian, D., Montone, C., Carranza, I., Lindholm, K., & Proctor, P. (1996). *Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two languages.* Final Report. Santa Cruz, CA & Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Christian, D., & Whitcher, A. (1995). *Directory of two-bilingual programs in the United States, Revised*. Santa Cruz, CA & Washington, DC: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Crandall, J. (Ed.). (1987). *ESL through content area instruction*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Regents.

Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Genesee, F. (1994). *Integrating language and content: Lessons from immersion* (Educational Practice Report No. 11). The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Lightbown, P. M. (1989). Process product research on second language learning in classrooms. In B. Harley, J. P. B. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of bilingual proficiency* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lyster, R. (1994). The effect of functional-analytical teaching on aspects of French immersion students' socio-linguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics, 15*(3), 263-287.

Mohan, B. (1986). *Language and content.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Räsänen, A. (1994). Language learning and bilingual education: Theoretical considerations & practical experiences. In A. Räsänen & D. Marsh (Eds.), *Content instruction through a foreign language,* (pp. 9-31). University of Finland: Continuing Education Centre.

Swain, M., & Carroll, S. (1987). The immersion observation study. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins, & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of bilingual proficiency* (pp. 190-263). Toronto: Modern Language Centre.

APPENDIX 1

Research Team Members

NAME	ROLE	SCHOOL/OFFICE	GRADE/ LANG.
Dorry Kenyon	Proj. Co-Director	CAL	
MaryAnn Ullrich	Proj. Co-Director	Arlington Public Schools Supervisor, Dept. of Foreign Languages	
Chris Montone	Proj. Coordinator	CAL	
Evelyn Fernández	Proj. Specialist	Arlington Public Schools Immersion Program Coordinator	4th-5th Grades Spanish and English
Jackie Martin	Teacher/Researcher	Key Elementary	1st Grade English
Elizabeth Burgos	Teacher/Researcher	Abingdon Elementary	1st Grade Spanish
Karine Szakos	Teacher/Researcher	Oakridge Elementary	2nd Grade English
Carmen De La Cruz	Teacher/Researcher	Key Elementary	3rd Grade Spanish
Nereida Franco	Teacher/Researcher	Abingdon Elementary	3rd Grade Spanish
Elvia Santamaria	Teacher/Researcher	Williamsburg Middle	6th-8th Grades Spanish
Kathy Davin	Teacher/Researcher	Key Elementary	Reading Specialist
Heidi Soehrmann	Teacher/Researcher	Key Elementary	Special Education

APPENDIX 2

Rubrics for Speaking and Writing

Grades 1-5

(English and Spanish Versions)

Student: ____________________
Class: ____________________

Date: ____________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Speaking Objectives
Grade 1

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Comprehension 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	**Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed** ___ Always ___ Most of the time ___ **Much of the time** ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely ___ With non-verbal cues only	
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses native-like flow of speech ___ Uses fluent connected speech ___ Uses fluent connected speech, occasionally disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ **Uses simple sentences** ___ Uses phrases and "chunks" ___ Uses one-word/two-word utterances ___ Silence	
Vocabulary 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses varied and descriptive language, possibly including native-like phrasing and/or idiomatic expressions ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts, with some varied and descriptive language ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts ___ **Uses vocabulary sufficient to express basic needs and feelings; responds to simple questions, with limited or no use of first language** ___ Uses only basic vocabulary with possible heavy use of first language ___ Uses isolated words or sentence fragments ___ Uses native language only	
Grammar 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses basic grammar; makes some errors which obscure meaning** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ No oral production ___ Present tense ___ Past tense ___ Future tense ___ Complex verbal structures ___ Gender agreement ___ Singular/Plural ___ Subject-verb agreement ___ Negations ___ Adjective placement ___ Direct object pronouns ___ Prepositions ___ Articles	

Total (optional): ________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student: ____________________
Class: ____________________
Date: ____________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Speaking Objectives
Grade 2

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Comprehension 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	**Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed** ___ Always ___ **Most of the time** ___ Much of the time ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely ___ With non-verbal cues only	
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses native-like flow of speech ___ Uses fluent connected speech ___ Uses fluent connected speech, occasionally disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ **Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression** ___ Uses simple sentences ___ Uses phrases and "chunks" ___ Uses one-word/two-word utterances ___ Silence	
Vocabulary 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses varied and descriptive language, possibly including native-like phrasing and/or idiomatic expressions ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts, with some varied and descriptive language ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts ___ **Uses vocabulary sufficient to express basic needs and feelings; and retell or respond in familiar contexts with limited or no use of first language** ___ Uses only basic vocabulary with possible use of first language ___ Uses isolated words or sentence fragments ___ Uses native language only	
Grammar 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses basic grammar; makes few errors which obscure meaning** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ No oral production ___ Present tense ___ Past tense ___ Future tense ___ Complex verbal structures ___ Gender agreement ___ Singular/Plural ___ Subject-verb agreement ___ Negations ___ Adjective placement ___ Direct object pronouns ___ Prepositions ___ Articles	

Total (optional): ________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Student: ____________________
Class: ____________________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Speaking Objectives
Grade 3

Date: ____________

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Comprehension 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	**Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed** ___ Always ___ **Most of the time** ___ Much of the time ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely	
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses native-like flow of speech ___ Uses fluent connected speech ___ **Uses fluent connected speech, occasionally disrupted by search for correct form of expression** ___ Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ Uses simple sentences ___ Uses phrases and "chunks"	
Vocabulary 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses varied and descriptive language, possibly including native-like phrasing and/or idiomatic expressions ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts, with some varied and descriptive language ___ **Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in social and academic contexts** ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts ___ Use vocabulary sufficient to express needs and feelings, and retell or respond in familiar contexts with limited or no use of first language ___ Uses only basic vocabulary with possible use of first language ___ Uses isolated words or sentence fragments	
Grammar 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Controls present tense, gender, and number agreement** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ Present tense ___ Past tenses ___ Future tense ___ Complex verbal structures ___ Gender agreement ___ Singular/Plural ___ Subject-verb agreement ___ Negations ___ Adjective placement ___ Direct object pronouns ___ Prepositions ___ Articles	

Total (optional): ________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student: ____________________
Class: ____________________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Speaking Objectives
Grade 4

Date: ___________

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Comprehension 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	**Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed** ___ **Always** ___ Most of the time ___ Much of the time ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely	
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses native-like flow of speech ___ **Uses fluent connected speech** ___ Uses fluent connected speech, occasionally disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ Uses simple sentences	
Vocabulary 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses varied and descriptive language, possibly including native-like phrasing and/or idiomatic expressions ___ **Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts, with some varied and descriptive language** ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts ___ Use vocabulary sufficient to express needs and feelings, and retell or respond in familiar contexts with limited or no use of first language ___ Uses only basic vocabulary with possible use of first language	
Grammar 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses appropriate tenses, pronouns, gender and number agreement, and adjective placement** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ Present tense ___ Past tenses ___ Future tense ___ Complex verbal structures ___ Gender agreement ___ Singular/Plural ___ Subject-verb agreement ___ Negations ___ Adjective placement ___ Direct object pronouns ___ Prepositions ___ Articles	

Total (optional): ________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student: ____________________

Class: ____________________

Date: __________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program

Speaking Objectives

Grade 5

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Comprehension 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	**Comprehends speech at varying rates of speed and in a variety of contexts** ___ Always ___ **Most of the time** ___ Much of the time ___ Sometimes ___ Rarely	
Fluency 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses native-like flow of speech ___ **Uses fluent connected speech** ___ Uses fluent connected speech, occasionally disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression ___ Uses simple sentences	
Vocabulary 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses sophisticated vocabulary in a variety of contexts ___ **Uses varied and descriptive language, possibly including native-like phrasing and/or idiomatic expressions** ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts with some varied and descriptive language ___ Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts ___ Use vocabulary sufficient to express needs and feelings, and retell or respond in familiar contexts with limited or no use of first language ___ Uses only basic vocabulary with possible use of first language	
Grammar 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses appropriate tenses, pronouns, gender and number agreement, negation, articles, prepositions, and adjective placement** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ Present tense ___ Past tenses ___ Future tense ___ Complex verbal structures ___ Gender agreement ___ Singular/Plural ___ Subject-verb agreement ___ Negations ___ Adjective placement ___ Direct object pronouns ___ Prepositions ___ Articles	

Total (optional): ________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Student: ____________________

Class: ____________________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Writing Objectives
Grade 1

Date: ______________

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Composing **1 2 3 4 5** **(circle one)** low high	___ Develops a story/topic with supporting details ___ Writes about a topic with a central idea ___ **Writes related sentences about a specific topic** ___ Writes some related sentences and some unrelated sentences ___ Writes single sentence or unrelated sentences ___ Uses letter strings, labels and/or words only ___ Draws related to the topic	
Style	NA	
Sentence Formation **1 2 3 4 5** low high	___ Uses all types of sentences effectively ___ Uses different types of sentences ___ **Writes simple sentences expressing complete thoughts** ___ Writes simple sentences ___ Attempts to write sentences ___ Labels or writes words only ___ Uses letter strings and/or environmental print only ___ No evidence	
Usage **1 2 3 4 5** low high	**Makes correct singular/plural noun formations** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct gender formations** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Demonstrates awareness that articles and nouns should agree** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable	
Mechanics **1 2 3 4 5** low high	**Demonstrates knowledge of sound-symbol correspondence** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses capital letters at beginning of sentences** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses capital letters with proper nouns** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct final punctuation** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable	

Total (optional): ______________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Student: ____________
Class: ____________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Writing Objectives
Grade 2

Date: ____________

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Composing 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	___ Fully develops a story/topic with supporting or descriptive details ___ **Develops an organized story/topic that follows a logical sequence** ___ Partially develops a story/topic ___ Writes some related sentences only, without a clear central idea ___ Writes unrelated sentences only	
Style 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Enhances writing through use of details, descriptive language, and sense of voice ___ Enhances writing through use of details and some descriptive language ___ **Enhances writing by experimenting with details** ___ Uses non-specific vocabulary and little or no descriptive language ___ Writes basic objective information with no elements of style evident	
Sentence Formation 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Varies sentence type, length, and structure; uses transitions appropriately ___ Varies length and structure; uses some transitions ___ **Experiments with different sentence structures** ___ Writes simple sentences expressing complete thoughts ___ Attempts to write sentences ___ Labels or writes words only ___ Uses letter strings and/or environmental print only	
Usage 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Demonstrates awareness of time, gender, and number agreement** (Check only those areas that need work. Write "NA" if no evidence elicited during task.) ___ Present time ___ Past time ___ Future time ___ Gender agreement ___ Number agreement ___ Subject-verb agreement	
Mechanics 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses correct spelling** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct final punctuation** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct capitalization** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct formatting (e.g., indentation)** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable	

Total (optional): ____________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student: ____________________

Class: ____________________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Writing Objectives
Grade 3

Date: ______________

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Composing 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	___ Fully develops a story/topic with appropriate use of paragraphs and supporting details ___ **Fully develops a story/topic with supporting details** ___ Develops an organized story/topic that follows a logical sequence ___ Partially develops a story/topic ___ Writes some related sentences only, without a clear central idea	
Style 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Demonstrates a good sense of audience, voice, and descriptive detail ___ Demonstrates a sense of audience, in addition to use of voice and descriptive detail ___ Enhances writing through use of voice, in addition to use of descriptive detail ___ **Enhances writing through use of details and descriptive language** ___ Enhances writing by experimenting with details ___ Uses non-specific vocabulary and little or no descriptive language ___ Writes basic objective information with no elements of style evident	
Sentence Formation 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Varies sentence type, length, and structure; uses transitions appropriately ___ Varies type, length and structure; uses some transitions ___ **Uses different sentence structures appropriately** ___ Experiments with different sentence structures ___ Writes simple sentences expressing complete thoughts	
Usage 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses correct verb forms (present, past, future)** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct forms of agreement (gender, number, subject-verb)** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct placement (adjectives, pronouns)** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct prepositions** Circle one: Consistently Usually **Sometimes** Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable	
Mechanics 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Usually uses correct spelling and punctuation, capitalization, and formatting** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ Spelling ___ Punctuation ___ Capitalization ___ Formatting	

Total (optional): ____________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Student: ____________________

Class: ____________________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Writing Objectives
Grade 4

Date: ______________

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Composing 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	___ Presents an original, focused, coherent topic with supporting paragraphs, and that gives an opinion or convincingly persuades ___ Presents a well-organized topic that displays both depth and detail ___ **Develops a story/topic with appropriate use of paragraphs, supporting details, and a clear introduction and conclusion** ___ Presents a story/topic with a central idea and some supporting examples or details ___ Presents a partially-developed story/topic that may include some unrelated information ___ Writes some related sentences only, but without a clear central idea	
Style 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses vivid vocabulary, precise wording, and figurative language to enhance a point of view ___ Demonstrates a good sense of audience, voice, and descriptive detail ___ Demonstrates a sense of audience, in addition to use of voice and descriptive detail ___ **Enhances writing through use of voice, in addition to use of descriptive detail** ___ Enhances writing through use of details and descriptive language ___ Enhances writing by experimenting with details ___ Uses non-specific vocabulary and little or no descriptive language	
Sentence Formation 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Varies sentence type, length, and structure; uses transitions appropriately ___ **Varies type, length and structure; uses some transitions** ___ Uses different sentence structures appropriately ___ Experiments with different sentence structures ___ Writes simple sentences expressing complete thoughts	
Usage 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses correct verb forms (present, past, future)** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct forms of agreement (gender, number, subject-verb)** Circle one: **Consistently** Usually Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct placement (adjectives, pronouns)** Circle one: **Consistently** Usually Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable **Uses correct prepositions** Circle one: Consistently **Usually** Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable	
Mechanics 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Consistently uses correct spelling and punctuation, capitalization, and formatting** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ Spelling ___ Punctuation ___ Capitalization ___ Formatting	

Total (optional): ____________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Student: ____________________

Class: ____________________

Date: ______________

Arlington County Spanish Partial Immersion Program
Writing Objectives
Grade 5

Skill Components	Component Descriptors	Comments
Composing 1 2 3 4 5 (circle one) low high	___ Presents an original, focused, coherent topic with supporting paragraphs, and that gives an opinion or convincingly persuades ___ **Presents a well-organized topic that displays both depth and detail** ___ Develops a story/topic with appropriate use of paragraphs, supporting details, and a clear introduction and conclusion ___ Presents a coherent thesis with some supporting examples or details ___ Presents a partially-developed thesis that may include some unrelated information ___ Writes some related sentences only, but without a clear central idea	
Style 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Uses vivid vocabulary, precise wording, and figurative language to enhance a point of view ___ Demonstrates a good sense of audience, voice, and descriptive detail ___ **Demonstrates a sense of audience, in addition to use of voice and descriptive detail** ___ Enhances writing through use of voice, in addition to use of descriptive detail ___ Enhances writing through use of details and descriptive language ___ Enhances writing by experimenting with details ___ Uses non-specific vocabulary and little or no descriptive language	
Sentence Formation 1 2 3 4 5 low high	___ Sentence formations demonstrate a higher level of sophistication ___ **Varies sentence type, length, and structure; uses transitions appropriately** ___ Varies type, length and structure; uses some transitions ___ Uses different sentence structures appropriately ___ Experiments with different sentence structures ___ Writes simple sentences expressing complete thoughts	
Usage 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Uses correct verb forms (present, past, future, subjunctive)** Circle one: **Consistently** Usually Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct forms of agreement (gender, number, subject-verb)** Circle one: **Consistently** Usually Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct placement (adjectives, pronouns)** Circle one: **Consistently** Usually Sometimes Seldom **Uses correct prepositions** Circle one: **Consistently** Usually Sometimes Seldom No Evidence Not Applicable	
Mechanics 1 2 3 4 5 low high	**Consistently uses correct spelling and punctuation, capitalization, and formatting** (Check only those areas that need work.) ___ Spelling ___ Punctuation ___ Capitalization ___ Formatting	

Total (optional): ____________

Developed by Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ________________

Tarea: ______________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para Evaluar la Destreza Oral

Primer Grado

Fecha: ____________

Clase: ____________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Comprensión 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	**Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal** ___Siempre ___La mayoría de las veces **___Con frecuencia** ___Algunas veces ___Raras veces ___Con ayuda visual	
Capacidad Expresiva 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje fluido propio de un nativo. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que en *ocasiones* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que con *frecuencia* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. **__ Se expresa en oraciones simples.** __ Usa palabras sueltas o frases aisladas. __ Usa palabras aisladas/monosílabas. __ Silencio	
Vocabulario 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado que puede incluir frases y/o expresiones idiomáticas como las de un nativo. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico, expresándose ocasionalmente en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico. **__ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades básicas; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna.** __ Se comunica con un vocabulario básico pero a veces intercala palabras o frases de su lengua materna. __ Usa palabras aisladas y/o oraciones fragmentadas. __ Usa exclusivamente la lengua materna.	
Gramática 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Utiliza una forma gramatical básica y algunas veces incurre en errores que oscurecen la claridad de la idea expresada .** (Marque con un ✓ las áreas que el estudiante necesita mejorar; deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) __ No hay producción oral __ Presente __ Pasado __ Futuro __ Concordancia con el género __ Singular/plural __ Concordancia del sujeto/verbo __ Negaciones __ Lugar del adjetivo __ Preposiciones __ Artículos	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional)____________

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para Evaluar la Destreza Oral

Fecha: ______________

Tarea: ___________________________________

Segundo Grado

Clase: ______________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Comprensión 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	**Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.** ___Siempre **___La mayoría de las veces** ___Con frecuencia ___Algunas veces ___Raras veces ___Con ayuda visual	
Capacidad Expresiva 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje fluido propio de un nativo. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que en *ocasiones* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. **__ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que con *frecuencia* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta.** __ Se expresa en oraciones simples. __ Usa palabras sueltas o frases aisladas. __ Usa palabras aisladas/monosílabas solamente. __ Silencio	
Vocabulario 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado que puede incluir frases y/o expresiones idiomáticas como las de un nativo. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico, expresándose *ocasionalmente* en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico. **__ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades básicas; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna.** __ Se comunica con un vocabulario básico pero a veces intercala palabras o frases de su lengua materna. __ Usa palabras aisladas y/o oraciones fragmentadas. __ Usa exclusivamente la lengua materna.	
Gramática 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Incurre en algunos errores que oscurecen la claridad de la idea expresada .** (Marque con un ✓ las áreas que el estudiante necesita mejorar; deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) __ No hay producción oral __ Presente __ Pasado __ Futuro __ Concordancia con el género __ Singular/plural __ Concordancia del sujeto/verbo __ Negaciones __ Lugar del adjetivo __ Pronombres como sujeto directo __ Preposiciones __ Artículos	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ________________

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ____________________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para Evaluar la Destreza Oral

Tercer Grado

Fecha: ______________

Clase: ______________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Comprensión 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	**Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.** ___Siempre **___La mayoría de las veces** ___Con frecuencia ___Algunas veces ___Raras veces	
Capacidad Expresiva 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje fluido propio de un nativo. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo. **__ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que en *ocasiones* se detiene para en pensar la forma de expresión correcta.** __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que con *frecuencia* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. __ Se expresa en oraciones simples. __ Usa palabras sueltas o frases aisladas .	
Vocabulario 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado que puede incluir frases y/o expresiones idiomáticas como las de un nativo. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico, expresándose ocasionalmente en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado. **__ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico.** __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna. __ Se comunica con un vocabulario básico pero a veces intercala palabras o frases de su lengua materna. __ Usa palabras sueltas, frases aisladas y/o oraciones fragmentadas.	
Gramática 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Controla el uso del presente y la concordancia del género y el número.** (Marque con un ✓ las áreas que el estudiante necesita mejorar; deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) __ Presente __ Pasado __ Futuro __ Vocablos complejos __ Concordancia con el género __ Singular/plural __ Concordancia del sujeto/verbo __ Negaciones __ Lugar del adjetivo __ Pronombres como sujeto directo __ Preposiciones __ Artículos	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ____________

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ______________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para Evaluar la Destreza Oral

Cuarto Grado

Fecha: ____________

Clase: ____________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Comprensión 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	**Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.** ___**Siempre** ___La mayoría de las veces ___Con frecuencia ___Algunas veces ___Raras veces	
Capacidad Expresiva 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje fluido propio de un nativo. __ **Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo.** __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que en *ocasiones* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que con *frecuencia* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. __ Se expresa en oraciones simples.	
Vocabulario 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado que puede incluir frases y/o expresiones idiomáticas como las de un nativo. __ **Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico, expresándose ocasionalmente en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado.** __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna. __ Se comunica con un vocabulario básico pero a veces intercala palabras o frases de su lengua materna.	
Gramática 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Usa los tiempos de los verbos, los pronombres, la concordancia del género y número y el lugar del adjetivo.** (Marque con un ✓ las áreas que el estudiante necesita mejorar; deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) __ Presente __ Pasado __ Futuro __ Vocablos complejos __ Concordancia con el género __ Singular/plural __ Concordancia del sujeto/verbo __ Negaciones __ Lugar del adjetivo __ Pronombres como sujeto directo __ Preposiciones __ Artículos	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ______________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ______________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para Evaluar la Destreza Oral

Quinto Grado

Fecha: ____________

Clase: ____________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Comprensión 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	**Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal y en una variedad de contextos.** ___Siempre **___La mayoría de las veces** ___Con frecuencia ___Algunas veces ___Raras veces	
Capacidad Expresiva 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje fluido propio de un nativo. **__ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo.** __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que en *ocasiones* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. __ Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que con *frecuencia* se detiene para pensar en la forma de expresión correcta. __ Se expresa en oraciones simples.	
Vocabulario 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y sofisticado en una variedad de contextos. **__ Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado que puede incluir frases y/o expresiones idiomáticas como las de un nativo.** __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico, expresándose *ocasionalmente* en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico. __ Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna. __ Se comunica con un vocabulario básico pero a veces intercala palabras o frases de su lengua materna.	
Gramática 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Usa los tiempos de los verbos, los pronombres, la concordancia del género y número y el lugar del adjetivo apropiadamente.** (Marque con un ✓ las áreas que el estudiante necesita mejorar; deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) __ Presente __ Pasado __ Futuro __ Vocablos complejos __ Concordancia con el género __ Singular/plural __ Concordancia del sujeto/verbo __ Negaciones __ Lugar del adjetivo __ Pronombres como sujeto directo __ Preposiciones __ Artículos	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ____________

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________
Tarea: ______________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para la Destreza Escrita

Fecha: __________
Clase: __________

Primer Grado

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Composición 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	__Desarrolla una narración con detalles. __Escribe una narración simple sobre un tema específico. __**Escribe oraciones relacionadas sobre un tema especifico.** __Escribe algunas oraciones relacionadas y otras no relacionadas. __Escribe oraciones no relacionadas al tema. __Rotula o escribe palabras solamente. __Hace dibujos relacionados al tema.	
Estilo	N/A (No aplica a este nivel)	
Expresión Estructural 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__Usa todo tipo de oraciones efectivamente. __Usa diferente tipos de oraciones. __**Escribe oraciones simples que expresan ideas completas.** __Escribe oraciones simples. __Intenta escribir oraciones. __ Rotula o escribe palabras solamente. __ Intenta escribir letras y/o copia palabras que ve a su alrededor. __ No hay evidencia.	
Uso 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Uso correcto del sustantivo en singular y plural.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Uso correcto del género gramatical.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidente No aplica a este nivel **Reconoce la relación directa del artículo y el sustantivo.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidente No aplica a este nivel	
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Demuestra conocimiento de la relación entre simbolo y sonido.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Usa mayúscula al empezar oraciones.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Escribe los nombres propios con mayúscula.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Usa puntuación al comienzo y/o final de las oraciones correctamente.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ______________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ____________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para la Destreza Escrita
Segundo Grado

Fecha: ____________

Clase: ____________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Composición 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	__ Desarrolla el tema narrativo o cuento con detalles o descripciones. __ **Desarrolla el tema narrativo o cuento siguiendo una secuencia lógica.** __ Desarrolla el tema narrativo o cuento parcialmente. __ Escribe solamente algunas oraciones relacionadas al tema pero sin idea central. __ Escribe solamente oraciones no relacionadas al tema.	
Estilo 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa detalles y lenguaje descriptivo con expresión. __ Realza la escritura a través del uso de detalles y lenguaje descriptivo. __ **Realza la escritura experimentando con detalles.** __ Usa vocabulario no específico usando poco o ningún lenguaje descriptivo. __ Escribe información sin evidencia de elementos de estilo.	
Expresión Estructural 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad y estructura; usa palabras transitivas con efectividad. __ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad; usa algunas ideas transitivas. __ **Experimenta con diferentes estructuras gramaticales.** __ Escribe oraciones simples que expresan ideas completas. __ Intenta escribir oraciones. __ Rotula o escribe palabras solamente. __ Intenta escribir letras y/o copia palabras que ve a su alrededor.	
Uso 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Demuestra conocimiento de la congruencia entre tiempo, género y número.** (Marcar todas las que apliquen. Escribir "N/A" si no hay evidencia.) ___Tiempo presente ____Pasado ____Futuro cercano (ir+verbo) ____género ____número ____sujeto/verbo	
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Uso correcto de la ortografía.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Uso correcto de la puntuación al comienzo y/o final de las oraciones.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Uso correcto de las mayúsculas.** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel **Uso correcto del formato de un párrafo (e.g., márgenes, sangrado)** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica a este nivel	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ____________73

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ______________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para la Destreza Escrita

Tercer Grado

Fecha: ______________

Clase: ______________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Composición 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	__ Desarrolla completamente el tema o cuento en párrafos bien organizados, detallados y descriptivos. __ **Desarrolla completamente el tema o cuento con detalles y descripciones.** __ Desarrolla el tema o cuento de modo organizado, siguiendo una secuencia lógica. __ Desarrolla parcialmente el tema o cuento. __ Escribe solamente oraciones relacionadas al tema, pero sin una idea central clara.	
Estilo 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Demuestra un buen sentido de la audiencia; usa diferentes expresiones y detalles descriptivos. __ Demuestra sentido de la audiencia además de usar expresiones apropiadas y detalles descriptivos. __ Realza la escritura usando expresiones apropiadas además de usar detalles descriptivos. __ **Realza la escritura a través del uso de detalles y lenguaje descriptivo.** __ Realza la escritura experimentando con detalles. __ Usa vocabulario no específico usando copo o ningún lenguaje descriptivo. __ Escribe información sin evidencia de elementos de estilo.	
Expresión Estructural 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad y estructura; usa palabras transitivas con efectividad. __ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad; usa algunas ideas transitivas. __ **Usa apropiadamente diferentes estructuras gramaticales.** __ Experimenta con diferentes estructuras gramaticales. __ Escribe oraciones simples que expresan ideas completas.	
Uso 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Usa correctamente las formas de los verbos (presente, pasado, futuro)** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces **Usa correctamente las formas de congruencia (género, número, sujeto-verbo)** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces **Usa correctamente la posición de los adjetivos y pronombres** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica	
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Por lo general usa correctamente la ortografía, la puntuación, las mayúsculas y el formato.** (Marcar con un ✓ las áreas que necesita mejorar, deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) ____ortografía ____puntuación ____mayúsculas ____ formato	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ______________

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ____________________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para la Destreza Escrita

Cuarto Grado

Fecha: ____________

Clase: ____________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Composición 1 2 3 4 5 (escoger uno) bajo alto	__ Desarrolla un tema con un enfoque original, con párrafos coherentes que desarrollan una opinión o que persuade convincentemente. __ Desarrolla con profundidad y con detalles un tema bien organizado. **__ Desarrolla completamente el tema con párrafos bien organizados, detalles y con introducción y conclusión claras.** __ Desarrolla un tema con una idea central y con algunos detalles. __ Desarrolla parcialmente el tema que puede incluir alguna información incoherente. __ Escribe oraciones relacionadas al tema solamente, sin una idea central clara.	
Estilo 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa vocabulario colorido, palabras precisas y lenguaje figurado para exponer su punto de vista. __ Demuestra un buen sentido de la audiencia; usa diferentes expresiones y detalles descriptivos. __ Demuestra sentido de la audiencia además de usar expresiones apropiadas y detalles descriptivos. **__ Realza la escritura usando expresiones apropiadas además de usar detalles descriptivos.** __ Realza la escritura experimentando con detalles. __ Usa vocabulario no específico usando poco o ningún lenguaje descriptivo. __ Escribe información sin evidencia de elementos de estilo.	
Expresión Estructural 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad y estructura; usa palabras transitivas con efectividad. **__ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad; usa algunas palabras transitivas.** __ Usa apropiadamente diferentes estructuras gramaticales. __ Experimenta con diferentes estructuras gramaticales. __ Escribe oraciones simples que expresan ideas completas.	
Uso 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Usa correctamente las formas de los verbos (presente, pasado, futuro)** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces **Usa correctamente las formas de congruencia (género, número, sujeto-verbo)** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces **Usa correctamente la posición de los adjetivos** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica **Usa correctamente los pronombres personales, directos e indirectos** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica	
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Por lo general usa correctamente la ortografía, la puntuación, las mayúsculas y el formato.** (Marcar con un ✓ las áreas que necesita mejorar, deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) ____ortografía ____puntuación ____mayúsculas ____ formato	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ______77______

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Nombre del estudiante: ____________________

Tarea: ____________________________________

Programa de Inmersión Parcial de Español
del Condado de Arlington
Rúbrica para la Destreza Escrita

Quinto Grado

Fecha: ____________

Clase: ____________

Destrezas	***Descripción***	***Comentarios***
Composición 1 2 3 4 5 bajo (escoger uno) alto	__ Desarrolla un tema con un enfoque original, con párrafos coherentes que desarrollan una opinión o que persuade convincentemente. __ **Desarrolla con profundidad y con detalles un tema bien organizado.** __ Desarrolla completamente el tema con párrafos bien organizados, detalles y con introducción y conclusión claras. __ Desarrolla un tema con una idea central y con algunos detalles. __ Desarrolla parcialmente el tema que puede incluir alguna información incoherente. __ Escribe oraciones relacionadas al tema solamente, sin una idea central clara.	
Estilo 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa vocabulario colorido, palabras precisas y lenguaje figurado para exponer su punto de vista. __ Demuestra un buen sentido de la audiencia; usa diferentes expresiones y detalles descriptivos. __ **Demuestra sentido de la audiencia además de usar expresiones apropiadas y detalles descriptivos.** __ Realza la escritura usando expresiones apropiadas además de usar detalles descriptivos. __ Realza la escritura experimentando con detalles. __ Usa vocabulario no específico usando poco o ningún lenguaje descriptivo. __ Escribe información sin evidencia de elementos de estilo.	
Expresión Estructural 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	__ Usa formas gramaticales que denotan un nivel un tanto sofisticado. __ **Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad y estructura; usa palabras transitivas con efectividad.** __ Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad; usa algunas palabras transitivas. __ Usa apropiadamente diferentes estructuras gramaticales. __ Experimenta con diferentes estructuras gramaticales. __ Escribe oraciones simples que expresan ideas completas.	
Uso 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Usa correctamente las formas de los verbos (presente, pasado, futuro y subjuntivo)** *Escoger uno:* **Consistentemente** Usualmente Algunas veces Raras veces **Usa correctamente las formas de congruencia (género, número, sujeto-verbo)** *Escoger uno:* **Consistentemente** Usualmente Algunas veces Raras veces **Usa correctamente la posición de los adjetivos** *Escoger uno:* **Consistentemente** Usualmente Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica **Usa correctamente los pronombres personales, directos e indirectos** *Escoger uno:* Consistentemente **Usualmente** Algunas veces Raras veces No hay evidencia No aplica	
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada 1 2 3 4 5 bajo alto	**Usa correctamente la ortografía, la puntuación, las mayúsculas y el formato consistentemente.** (Marcar con un ✓ las áreas que necesita mejorar, deje en blanco si no hay evidencia.) ____ortografía ____puntuación ____mayúsculas ____ formato	

RESULTADO TOTAL (opcional) ____________________

Creado por Arlington Public Schools, Arlington, VA, 1997

APPENDIX 3

Scoring Guide for Rubrics

(English and Spanish Versions)

Guide to Scoring the Rubrics

1 — Does not approximate the end-of-year expectation at this grade level

2 — Approximates the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

3 — Meets the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

4 — Exceeds the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

5 — Far exceeds the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

Guía de calificación para usar con la escala numérica

1 -- No se aproxima a las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

2 -- Se aproxima a las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

3 -- Reúne las expectativas que se tienen como meta para ese grado al final del año escolar.

4 -- Pasa las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

5 -- Sobrepasa las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

APPENDIX 4

Classroom Matrices
for
Speaking and Writing Scores
(English and Spanish Versions)

HOW TO USE THE MATRICES

In order to facilitate the recording of information obtained from students about their oral and written language, different types of matrices have been developed by teachers. Teachers may choose to use these matrices depending on what is suitable to their own style or for what purposes they are recording the information. Some matrices are useful when recording information gathered on individual students. Other matrices may be used to record information about groups of students to help plan for subsequent instruction. Completed student record sheets can be placed in students' portfolios.

The information recorded in these matrices can be used for the following purposes:

- find out what each student is capable of learning;
- guide instruction, planning lessons according to each student's needs;
- reflect each student's strengths and weaknesses;
- group students for different purposes;
- document students' growth;
- conference with students;
- help students reach specific goals; and
- reporting to parents during Parent/Teacher Conferences or any other time during the year.

ASSESSMENT OF WRITING

Assessment Period:________________ **Class:** ________________

Student Names	Writing Components						Comments
	C	S	SF	U	M	Total	

ASSESSMENT OF SPEAKING

Assessment Period:__________________ Class: __________________

Student Names	Oral Components					Comments
	C	F	V	G	Total	

EVALUACION DE LA DESTREZA ESCRITA

Período de evaluación:______________ **Clase:** _________________

Nombre del estudiante	Componentes						Comentarios
	C	E	EE	U	TGA	Total	

EVALUACION DE LA DESTREZA ORAL

Período de Evalución:_______________ **Clase:** __________________

Nombre del estudiante	Componentes					Comentarios
	C	CE	V	G	Total	

Grade ____ Writing Sample Date________ Topic: ____________________________

	Students	Comments
Composition		
Style		
Sentence Formation		
Usage		
Mechanics		

SAMPLE

Grade 3 Writing Sample Date 4/3 Topic: My Favorite Animal

	Students	Comments
Composition	Luisa Carmen	Good details. Need to work on main idea.
Style	Luisa Carmen Tom	Work on effictive use of descriptions.
Sentence Formation	José Tom Carmen	Practice transition words and combining sentences.
Usage	Luisa Tom	Some difficulty with subject-verb agreement. He walk.
Mechanics	Luisa José Tom	Great spelling Need to work on format

Student:		Composite Score:
Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition		
Style		
Sentence Formation		
Usage		
Mechanics		

Student:		Composite Score:
Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition		
Style		
Sentence Formation		
Usage		
Mechanics		

Student:		Composite Score:
Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition		
Style		
Sentence Formation		
Usage		
Mechanics		

Student:		Composite Score:
Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition		
Style		
Sentence Formation		
Usage		
Mechanics		

SAMPLE

Student: Luisa My Favorite Animal Composite Score: 13

Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition	2	Piece needs to have
Style	3	central idea.
Sentence Formation	3	Good choice of words but
Usage	3	needs to use descriptions
Mechanics	2	effectively.

Student: Carmen My Favorite Animal Composite Score: 16

Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition	2	Work on main idea.
Style	3	Good mechanics
Sentence Formation	3	
Usage	4	
Mechanics	4	

Student: José My Favorite Animal Composite Score: 13

Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition	3	Excellent voice, maintains
Style	3	the interest of the reader.
Sentence Formation	2	
Usage	3	
Mechanics	2	

Student: Tom My Favorite Animal Composite Score: 11

Domain	Score	Remarks
Composition	3	Excellent spelling
Style	2	needs to work use
Sentence Formation	2	of transitions
Usage	2	
Mechanics	2	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grade ____ Oral Sample Date ____ Topic: __________

	Students	Comments
Comprehension		
Fluency		
Vocabulary		
Grammar		

SAMPLE

Grade 1 Oral Sample Date 5/24 Topic: Book review

	Students	Comments
Comprehension	Lois Grace	Some difficult keeping up with the discussion.
Fluency	Mark Lois	Frequent use of phrases
Vocabulary	Mark Lois Carlos	Work on synonyms
Grammar	Lois Tamara Carlos	Practice prepositions and past tense of irregular verbs.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Student: Composite Score:

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension		
Fluency		
Vocabulary		
Grammar		

Student: Composite Score:

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension		
Fluency		
Vocabulary		
Grammar		

Student: Composite Score:

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension		
Fluency		
Vocabulary		
Grammar		

Student: Composite Score:

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension		
Fluency		
Vocabulary		
Grammar		

Student: Composite Score:

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension		
Fluency		
Vocabulary		
Grammar		

Student: Lois **Composite Score:** 8

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension	2	Work on vocabulary
Fluency	2	Lois is motivated
Vocabulary	2	
Grammar	2	

Student: Grace **Composite Score:** 12

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension	3	Big improvement.
Fluency	3	
Vocabulary	3	
Grammar	3	

Student: Mark **Composite Score:** 12

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension	4	Excellent comprehension
Fluency	3	Work on vocabulary
Vocabulary	2	
Grammar	3	

Student: Carlos **Composite Score:** 10

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension	3	Carlos expresses his ideas
Fluency	3	in complete sentences.
Vocabulary	2	needs to develop
Grammar	2	vocabulary.

Student: Vanessa **Composite Score:** 15

Domain	Score	Remarks
Comprehension	4	Great vocabulary.
Fluency	3	
Vocabulary	4	
Grammar	4	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Grado ____ Destreza Escrita Fecha __________ Tema: ________________________________

	Estudiantes	Comentarios
Composición		
Estilo		
Expresión Estructural		
Uso		
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada		

SAMPLE

Grado 2 Destreza Escrita Fecha 5/6 Tema: Mi estación favorita

	Estudiantes	Comentarios
Composición	Martha Sylvia	Buen comienzo de la descripción pero necesitan trabajar en la conclusión.
Estilo	Kathy Mayra	Practicar con oraciones que den más detalles de la estación
Expresión Estructural	Mayra Sylvia Martha	Combinar oraciones.
Uso	Martha Sylvia	Repasar congruencia de género y número Los casa.
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada	Pedro Kathy	Repasar el uso de las mayúsculas.

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Composición		
Estilo		
Expresión Estructural		
Uso		
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Composición		
Estilo		
Expresión Estructural		
Uso		
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Composición		
Estilo		
Expresión Estructural		
Uso		
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Composición		
Estilo		
Expresión Estructural		
Uso		
Técnica Gramatical Aplicada		

Grado ____ Destreza Oral Fecha _______ Tema: ______________________________

	Estudiantes	Comentarios
Comprensión		
Capacidad Expresiva		
Vocabulario		
Gramática		

SAMPLE

Grado 4 Destreza Oral Fecha 3/2/96 Tema: Presentación de un proyecto de ciencias

	Estudiantes	Comentarios
Comprensión	Mary Ann John	Entendieron las preguntas de los estudiantes con alguna dificultad.
Capacidad Expresiva	Robert Antonio Mary Ann	Necesitan expresar sus ideas en oraciones completas
Vocabulario	Robert Ann John	Necesitan expandir su vacabulario para poder dar explicaciones más detalladas.
Gramática	Ann Antonio John	Repasar el pasado imperfecto de los verbos irregulares. Ej. quiero y pon.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Comprensión		
Capacidad Expresiva		
Vocabulario		
Gramática		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Comprensión		
Capacidad Expresiva		
Vocabulario		
Gramática		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Comprensión		
Capacidad Expresiva		
Vocabulario		
Gramática		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Comprensión		
Capacidad Expresiva		
Vocabulario		
Gramática		

Estudiante:		Total de Puntos:
Destreza	Puntos	Comentarios
Comprensión		
Capacidad Expresiva		
Vocabulario		
Gramática		

SAMPLE

Estudiante: Mary	Proyecto de Ciencias	Total de Puntos: 10
Destreza	**Puntos**	**Comentarios**
Comprensión	2	Usa el pasado correctamente
Capacidad Expresiva	2	necesita hablar más
Vocabulario	3	despacio y elaborar
Gramática	3	más sus ideas.
Estudiante: Ann	Proyecto de ciencias	Total de Puntos: 8
Destreza	**Puntos**	**Comentarios**
Comprensión	2	Desarrollar más el
Capacidad Expresiva	2	vocabulario para expresar
Vocabulario	2	las ideas con más fluidez.
Gramática	2	Practicar pasado de verbos irreg.
Estudiante: Antonio	Proyecto de Ciencias	Total de Puntos: 10
Destreza	**Puntos**	**Comentarios**
Comprensión	3	Excelente vocabulario y
Capacidad Expresiva	2	uso de la gramática con
Vocabulario	3	excepción de algunos verbos
Gramática	2	irregulares.
Estudiante: Robert	Proyecto de Ciencias	Total de Puntos: 10
Destreza	**Puntos**	**Comentarios**
Comprensión	3	Excelente comprensión.
Capacidad Expresiva	2	Necesita ampliar
Vocabulario	2	vocabulario. Usa oraciones
Gramática	3	simples.
Estudiante: John	Proyecto de ciencias	Total de Puntos: 8
Destreza	**Puntos**	**Comentarios**
Comprensión	2	Con frecuencia se detiene
Capacidad Expresiva	2	en busca de expresiones
Vocabulario	2	correctas
Gramática	2	

APPENDIX 5

Instructions for Using the Rubrics

(English and Spanish Versions)

Arlington County, VA
Spanish Partial-Immersion Program
Rubrics for Writing and Speaking in English and Spanish for Grades 1-5

April 30, 1997

Developed under a Field-Initiated Research Program grant from the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA),
U.S. Department of Education
CFDA Number: 84.292.B

Arlington Public Schools
Education Center
1426 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22207
703-358-6097

PURPOSE OF THESE RUBRICS

These rubrics are designed to assess the productive use (speaking and writing) of English and Spanish in two-way bilingual immersion classrooms. The rubrics were developed by classroom teachers working in elementary Spanish partial-immersion programs (two-way immersion) in Arlington, Virginia. Classroom teachers from grades 1-5 worked in consultation with a special education teacher, a reading specialist, a middle school partial immersion teacher, and researchers from the Center for Applied Linguistics on the development project.

The project's goal was to design a scoring instrument that:

1) could be used in authentic classroom situations;

2) would generate information useful in assessing student progress throughout the year;

3) would provide data useful in directing subsequent teaching; and

4) would articulate target expectations for language competency, designed to parallel state and local goals.

These rubrics take into consideration the developmental nature of immersion programs; that is, language skills and abilities develop over time. Thus, second language learners are not expected to perform at native speaker levels in the early years, but are challenged to approximate these levels of performance toward the end of the elementary school years.

Remember that this scoring instrument is designed to be used as one of several assessment tools. It is not meant to replace teacher, textbook, or standardized tests. Rather, the intent is to provide teachers with a scoring instrument which, used with authentic tasks, assesses productive language and provides ongoing information to help teachers plan, adjust, and adapt their teaching accordingly.

UNDERLYING CONSIDERATIONS

These rubrics are designed to show student progress, whether or not the target language in the assessment activity is the first or second language of the students. For example, in assessing Spanish writing, the same Spanish language version of the writing rubric is used for **all** students in the class—Spanish-dominant and English-dominant. The design was chosen based on principles and practicality. First, the teachers who developed these rubrics desired to maintain high expectations of native-like proficiency for all students. Second, they realized that it would be easier to use only **two** rubrics (one for writing, one for speaking) **rather than** four separate ones (one *writing* rubric for Spanish-dominant students and another for English-dominant ones, one *speaking* rubric for Spanish-dominant students, and another for English-dominant ones). To make this possible, the teachers designed the descriptors in each component area of each rubric to demonstrate the full range of language ability that a teacher could reasonably expect to see at each grade level for both native speakers and second language learners. This range was chosen to show snapshots of ability levels as well as allow for progress made by both groups of students throughout the year. As a result, the rubrics should be expansive enough to show both changes in native language ability and second language development.

WHAT IS NOT ASSESSED IN THE RUBRICS

Speaking Rubrics. Many assessment instruments for speaking proficiency include a component for evaluating "pronunciation." This component was intentionally omitted from these rubrics for the following reasons:

1) the developmental nature of two-way immersion does not necessitate teaching pronunciation, since it develops naturally in young children;
2) in such programs, teachers rarely teach pronunciation explicitly, and therefore should not assess pronunciation formally;
3) little information is gained by assessing pronunciation; and
4) in many two-way immersion programs, the focus is on ability to communicate meaning rather than on form.

If a teacher wants to note observations about a student's pronunciation, these could be marked in the "Comments" area of the "Fluency" component section.

Writing Rubrics. In the area of writing, the "Style" component was intentionally omitted from the first grade rubric since it was felt students at that grade level should not reasonably be expected to incorporate style into their writing.

TASKS APPROPRIATE FOR THE RUBRICS

The rubrics are designed to be used in coordination with a set of language elicitation tasks. For writing, teachers may use the county writing assessment. Some teachers may choose to use the rubric on a quarterly or even monthly basis with appropriate writing samples. Suggested tasks for oral language elicitation are provided for each grade level. However, a teacher may choose to substitute similar tasks to better match classroom content. The following criteria are provided as general guidelines for selecting appropriate tasks:

- performance of the task should provide evidence for each category of the respective rubric (i.e., comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and grammar for speaking objectives; composing, style, sentence formation, usage, and mechanics for writing objectives);

- the task should be applicable in both English and Spanish;

- the task should accommodate English as a Second Language resource students who participate in the immersion program;

- whenever possible, tasks should incorporate grade level themes; and

- in order to be authentic, the task should occur naturally in the curriculum and/or routine of the classroom.

COMPOSITION OF THE RUBRICS

Mini-Glossary

Skills: writing and speaking

Components: composition, style, sentence formation, usage, mechanics (for writing); comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, grammar (for speaking)

Descriptors: statements that describe a student's ability in a given skill component (e.g., Has native-like flow of speech)

Skills Assessed. There is one rubric for assessing writing for each grade (1-5) and one rubric for assessing speaking for each grade level (1-5). Each rubric is provided in English and in Spanish. While the two language versions are almost exactly the same, it is recommended that the English language version be used when assessing ability in English and the Spanish language version be used when assessing ability in Spanish, since there are some minor differences in the versions to account for differences between the languages (especially in the area of grammar).

Component Areas. Once teachers have elicited the students' language, it is assessed using descriptors for each component of the skill (i.e., composition, style, etc.). The components were adopted and adapted from extant assessments used by Arlington County Public Schools. The speaking components were based upon those used in the Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) and the writing components were taken from the Virginia Passport to Literacy, which all students in Virginia are expected to pass in order to graduate from high school.

Descriptors. The descriptors were crafted over time by the teachers and researchers involved in this development project. To the extent possible, descriptors from existing rubrics that showed developmentally-appropriate abilities were used. Teachers then made additions and adaptations to those descriptors, based on their own classroom teaching experience and awareness. Finally, the rubrics were piloted with writing and speech samples from students in one two-way program to see if they were realistic and usable. More adaptations were made as a result of the piloting.

The descriptors assume a progression in skill level within each component. These are presented in ascending order, starting at the bottom with the lowest skill level that may be seen at the grade level and moving upward to the highest skill level that may be demonstrated by a student in this grade. It should be understood that each descriptor, even if not explicitly stated, assumes the student has already developed the abilities—or overcome the limitations—represented in all of the descriptors below it. For example, in the third grade speaking rubric "Fluency" component, checking "Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression" implies that the student is able to perform the skills noted in the descriptors below it; that is, the student "Uses simple sentences" and "Uses phrases and 'chunks'."

Boldface Descriptors. For each skill component, the descriptor in boldface print represents what a second language learner ***should be striving toward*** as an end-of-year goal, and the performance level at which a student should reasonably or easily be able to operate in his/her dominant language.

No evidence/Not applicable. Some descriptors will offer "no evidence" or "not applicable" as options. Select "no evidence" if the student did not provide any evidence that s/he possesses or does not possess the skill being evaluated. For instance, if while assessing mechanics in writing no proper nouns are found in the writing sample, no evidence was available as to assess the student in the category "Uses capital letters with proper nouns" (grade 1).

Select "not applicable" if the nature of the assessment task did not present an opportunity to demonstrate a particular skill.

Comments. The "Comments" section of each component area can be used to make any comments or observations that would provide helpful supplementary information to your assessment, or to note significant information about a specific aspect of a student's performance. For example, comments might relate to the student's entry status in the class (late-entry), language acquisition stage (silent period), register usage (social or academic language), or assessment conditions (student unusually nervous during task).

HOW TO USE THE RUBRICS

The rating and scoring procedures were designed to accommodate individual preferences. To this end, rating and scoring can be done in at least two ways:

1) Based on the student language elicited (either spoken or written), the teacher checks the descriptor that best represents the student's performance on each skill component. These checked descriptors can be compared over time for more detailed information about student progress in each skill area; and/or

2) After checking the appropriate descriptors for each skill component, the teacher circles a number (1-5) for each skill component that best matches the student's performance level (see "Guide to Scoring the Rubrics" that accompanies each rubric). Numbered scores for each component can then be totaled (optional) and placed at the bottom of the sheet. These totals can be used for quick comparison of change over time and multiple assessment periods for each student.

When rating student performance, keep in mind that the boldface objectives reflect performance levels desired by the *end* of the school year. In other words, a teacher should be satisfied if a student has a 3 (target) level rating at the end of the year and should not be unsettled by lower ratings earlier in the year.

In cases where the grade-level goal (3 level) is described as "consistent" demonstration of a skill (as in Grade 4 Writing--Mechanics), higher levels of skill (4 and 5 levels) would be noted if the student demonstrated either superior command or usage of the component skill (e.g., comfortable, creative usage of language for "Fluency") or demonstrated ability to use other component skills not mentioned (e.g., use of semicolons, dashes, bulleted lists in "Mechanics").

Remember that the scores resulting from the use of these rubrics are not meant to replace the regular grading procedure used by the school. These rubrics were designed to provide teachers with an ***alternative*** means of assessing student progress in these skill areas on an ***ongoing*** basis, with the expectation that having periodic information on the development of these language skills would help improve and fine-tune classroom teaching and student learning.

A caveat must be issued here, as well, when using the numeric scale. To ensure rating on the scale of 1-5 is reliable, rater training should be done to condition multiple raters to both the instrument and the rating scale so that all raters have the same understanding of what each number means.

SCORING GUIDE FOR USE WITH THE NUMERIC SCALE

1 — Does not approximate the end-of-year expectation at this grade level

2 — Approximates the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

3 — Meets the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

4 — Exceeds the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

5 — Far exceeds the end-of-year expectation for this grade level

WHEN TO USE THE RUBRICS

The rubrics can be used at any time throughout the school year. Teachers are encouraged to use them *at least* twice a year, as a pre- and post-measure of student progress. End of the year expectations for each grade level are clearly indicated in boldface print for each skill component. This is meant to facilitate 1) instructional planning when used as a pre-test, and 2) instructional and student assessment when used as a post-test.

GLOSSARY

This glossary is provided to clarify terms used in the rubrics:

academic language: vocabulary (terms and expressions) introduced and used in the context of content area instruction (e.g., odd and even, *par e impar*)

complex structures (grammar): compound verb forms (e.g., I will have been teaching for 42 years by the time I retire.)

complex sentence: a sentence with one independent clause and at least one dependent clause (e.g., After coming home from my friend's house, I went to bed.)

component: a part of a skill (e.g., comprehension, fluency)

compound sentence: a sentence with two or more independent clauses usually joined by a conjunction (e.g., We went to the circus and some clowns made us laugh.)

compound-complex sentence: a sentence with at least two independent clauses and at least one dependent clause (e.g., After breakfast, we went to the circus and some clowns made us laugh.)

descriptor: a statement that decries a student's ability in a skill component (e.g., Uses isolated words)

fluent, fluency: speech that is fluid, unbroken, free of unnatural pauses or hesitations (i.e., those that might occur as the speaker searches for the appropriate word or expression due to language processing rather than to ordinary thinking processes)

idioms/idiomatic expressions: words or groups of words having a special meaning that is not inherent to or determinable from its component parts (e.g., take a bath, take a bus, *tener años, tener frio*); or an expression peculiar to a language that conveys a distinct meaning other than the literal meaning (e.g., to pull one's leg, *tomar el pelo*)

non-verbal cues: facial expressions, gestures, and so forth that enhance the verbal message (e.g., smiling, shaking one's head)

rubric: a scoring scale for assessing a set of skill components

sentence structures: simple, compound, complex, compound-complex

sentence types: declarative (i.e., statements), interrogative (i.e., questions), imperative (i.e., commands), exclamatory (i.e., exclamations)

social language: vocabulary and expressions necessary in daily communication that might not naturally occur in a content area class (e.g., I have a sore throat, *Me duele la garganta*)

transitions (writing): words that enhance the flow of ideas in writing, and signal the relationship between ideas and/or information presented (e.g., however, additionally, *sin embargo, con tal de que*)

Propósito de estas rúbricas

Estas rúbricas han sido diseñadas para medir la producción oral y escrita del lenguaje en inglés y en español en las clases del programa de inmersión bilingüe. Estas rúbricas han sido desarrolladas por maestras de los programas de inmersión parcial en español de las Escuelas Públicas de Arlington, Virginia. Varias maestras del primer al quinto grado, así como una maestra de educación especial, una especialista de lectura y una maestra del programa de inmersión del nivel intermedio trabajaron conjuntamente con investigadores del centro lingüístico "Center for Applied Linguistics" en el desarrollo de este proyecto.

La meta del proyecto fue la de diseñar un instrumento de medición que:

1. se pudiera utilizar en situaciones auténticas y realísticas dentro del salón de clase;

2. generara información adecuada y útil para la evaluación del progreso de los estudiantes durante el año escolar;

3. proporcionara información que pudiera ser utilizada subsecuentemente en la enseñanza; y

4. articulara metas específicas de competencia del lenguaje y que igualan las metas locales y del estado.

Estas rúbricas toman en consideración la naturaleza misma del programa de inmersión; esto es, que las habilidades y las destrezas del lenguaje se desarrollan a través del tiempo. Por consiguiente, no es de esperarse que los que aprenden un segundo idioma alcancen los niveles de los nativos en los primeros años, sino que éstos sean retados para que se aproximen a niveles superiores de aprovechamiento al final de la educación primaria.

Tenemos que recordar que este instrumento de medida no ha sido diseñado para ser usado como la única herramienta de evaluación. Ni tiene como propósito el reemplazar al maestro, los libros de texto, las pruebas o exámenes, al contrario, la intención es la de proveer una herramienta que pueda ser utilizada de forma auténtica en la evaluación de la producción oral y escrita proporcionando información que ayude al maestro a ajustar y adaptar su enseñanza al planificar sus lecciones subsiguientes.

Consideraciones importantes

Estas rúbricas han sido diseñadas para determinar el progreso del estudiante aun cuando el idioma, que es el objetivo en la actividad de la evaluación, sea el primer o segundo idioma del estudiante. Por ejemplo, en la evaluación de la escritura en español, la misma versión de la rúbrica es usada para todos los estudiantes en la clase--independientemente de que el idioma dominante sea el español o el inglés.

El diseño fue escogido basado en principios y que tuviese su sentido práctico. Primero, los maestros que desarrollaron estas rúbricas decidieron mantener expectativas altas en que las destrezas de comunicación de los estudiantes fueran semejantes a las de un nativo.

Segundo, concluyeron que sería más fácil el usar solamente dos rúbricas para todos los estudiantes (una para la escritura y otra para la parte oral), en lugar de cuatro (una para la escritura, para los que su idioma predominante es el español y otra para los que su idioma predominante es el inglés, otra oral para los que su idioma predominante es el español y otra oral para los que su idioma predominante es el inglés.) Para lograr esto, los maestros diseñaron descriptores--para cada uno de los componentes de cada rúbrica--que abarcaran todos los niveles de habilidad del lenguaje dentro de los parámetros razonables que los maestros pueden esperar de los estudiantes en cada grado en ambos grupos, nativos y aprendices del segundo idioma.

Esta escala fue desarrollada con el propósito de obtener a simple vista una visión global de los diferentes niveles de habilidad, así como también determinar el progreso alcanzado por ambos grupos de estudiantes a través del año escolar. Como resultado, las rúbricas deberán ser suficientemente amplias para demostrar tanto los cambios el desarrollo en la habilidad del uso del idioma nativo y el desarrollo del segundo idioma.

Lo que las rúbricas no mide

Rúbricas orales. Muchas de las herramientas para medir la capacidad oral incluye un componente para medir la **"pronunciación"**. Esta parte fue omitida intencionalmente por las siguientes razones:

1. Debido a la naturaleza misma del programa de inmersión que toma en consideración el desarrollo natural del lenguaje, la enseñanza de la pronunciación no se hace necesaria, ya que ésta se desarrolla de forma natural en los niños pequeños.

2. En este tipo de programas la maestra rara vez enseña la pronunciación de una forma explícita y por consiguiente ésta no debe ser medida formalmente.

3. La información obtenida al evaluar la pronunciación es de poca relevancia.

4. Muchos programas de inmersión tienen como enfoque la habilidad de comunicar las ideas y no la forma de expresión.

Si la maestra desea anotar alguna observación acerca de la pronunciación de algún estudiante, puede hacerlo en el espacio de **"Comentarios"** en la sección de la capacidad expresiva.

Rúbricas de escritura. En el área de la escritura el **"estilo"** fue omitido intencionalmente en las rúbricas del primer grado ya que no es razonable esperar que los estudiantes a este nivel incorporen estilo en su escritura.

Tareas apropiadas en el uso de las rúbricas

Las rúbricas están diseñadas para ser usadas en coordinación con un conjunto de tareas que ayuda a producir el lenguaje. Para la escritura, los maestros pueden usar también las medidas que se usan en el condado. Los maestros pueden usar las rúbricas tan a menudo como lo prefieran, dos, tres, o cuarto veces al año así como mensualmente con modelos apropiados de escritura. Se incluyen tareas orales y escritas como sugerencia para provocar el lenguaje oral espontáneo así como el escrito para cada nivel. Los maestros pueden cambiar o sustituir tareas con otras similares que se adapten mejor al contenido de la clase.

El siguiente criterio provee una guía general para seleccionar tareas apropiadas:

- el rendimiento de las tareas debe proveer evidencia de cada componente o categoría (ejemplo: comprensión, capacidad expresiva, vocabulario y gramática en la destreza oral; composición, expresión estructural, uso y técnica gramatical aplicada en la destreza de la escritura);

- las tareas deben ser apropiadas para ser usadas tanto en español como en inglés;

- las tareas deben acomodar a los estudiantes de inglés como segundo idioma que participan en el programa de inmersión;

- siempre que sea posible las tareas deben ser incorporadas en los temas de acuerdo al grado y al nivel; y

- para que esto sea auténtico, las tareas deben ocurrir de forma natural y espontánea dentro del programa y dentro de la rutina del salón de clase.

Composición de las rúbricas

Glosario

Destreza: Hablar y escribir.

Componentes: Composición, estilo, expresión estructural, uso, técnica gramatical aplicada (para escribir); comprensión, capacidad expresiva, vocabulario y gramática (para hablar).

Descriptores: Narración que describe la habilidad del estudiante en las partes de la destreza dada. (Ejemplo: se expresa en un lenguaje fluido propio de un nativo.)

Destrezas evaluadas. Una rúbrica que mide la habilidad de escribir para cada grado y la otra mide la habilidad de hablar para cada grado (1-5). Cada rúbrica está en inglés y español. A pesar de que ambas versiones son casi exactamente iguales, se recomienda que la versión en inglés se use sólo para medir la habilidad en inglés y la versión en español se use sólo para medir la habilidad en español, ya que hay pequeñas diferencias en ambas versiones para tomar en cuenta las diferencias entre los dos idiomas (especialmente en el área de gramática).

Componentes. Una vez que las maestras promueven el uso del lenguaje en los estudiantes, éste puede ser medido por medio de los descriptores la habilidad en cada área (ejemplo: composición, estilo, etc...). Las partes han sido adoptadas y adaptadas de medidas ya existentes usadas por el condado de Arlington en las escuelas públicas. Los componentes de la habilidad de hablar, por lo general, fueron basados en los usados en la prueba **Matriz para la Observación del Lenguaje Oral (SOLOM - Student Oral Language Observation Matrix)** y los componentes de la habilidad de la escritura fueron basados en los usados en la prueba de capacidad de leer y escribir del estado **Virginia Literacy Passport Test**, el cual todos los estudiantes de Virginia deberán pasar para poder graduarse de la secundaria.

Descriptores. Los maestros e investigadores envueltos en el desarrollo del proyecto trabajaron durante el período de un año en el diseño de los descriptores. En lo posible, se usaron descriptores de rúbricas ya existentes y que demuestran un desarrollo apropiado de las destrezas del lenguaje. Los maestros entonces procedieron a hacer las modificaciones y adaptaciones necesarias, basados en su propia experiencia adquirida en sus salones de clase y su propio conocimiento y juicio. Finalmente, las rúbricas fueron guiadas con ejemplos escritos y orales de estudiantes en el programa para ver si se conformaban a la realidad de los estudiantes y si eran fáciles de usar. Subsecuentes adaptaciones fueron necesarias como resultado de las guías de orientación.

Los descriptores asumen un desarrollo progresivo de las destrezas de cada componente. Estos son presentados en orden ascendente desde el nivel más bajo de destreza hasta el nivel más alto que puede demonstrar un estudiante de ese grado determinado.

Debe entenderse que cada descriptor, aunque no se haga referencia de un modo explícito, supone que el estudiante ya ha desarrollado la habilidad o ha sobrepasado las limitaciones representadas en todos los descriptores que están por debajo del señalado. Por ejemplo: cuando se marca en el componente de la capacidad expresiva de las rúbricas del tercer grado "Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fuido, a pesar de que con frecuencia se detiene para pensar la forma correcta de expresión", se sobreentiende que el estudiante tiene la habilidad de demostrar la destreza notada en los descriptores anteriores. Eso quiere decir que el estudiante ha sobrepasado el nivel de "Se expresa en oraciones simples" y "Usa palabras sueltas o frases aisladas".

Descriptores en negrita. Para cada componente de las destrezas, el descriptor en negrita indica lo que un aprendiz del segundo idioma debería lograr y tener como meta para el final del año escolar y el nivel de su rendimiento que es razonable o que fácilmente un estudiante puede lograr si se trata de su idioma dominante.

No hay evidencia / no es aplicable. Algunos descriptores indican " no evidencia" o que es una opción que "no aplica". Se debe seleccionar "No hay evidencia" si el estudiante no proporciona ninguna evidencia de que posee o no posee la destreza evaluada. Por ejemplo: si mientras se mide la técnica gramatical aplicada o mecánica de la escritura el estudiante no usa nombres propios, entonces no hay evidencia para medir la categoría "Escribe los nombres con mayúsculas" (primer año).

Se selecciona *"No aplicable"* si la naturaleza de la evaluación no presenta una oportunidad de demostrar una destreza en particular.

Comentarios. La sección "Comentarios" de cada componente puede ser usada para hacer comentarios u observaciones que van a proveer información adicional y suplementaria para la evaluación. También se debe anotar cualquier información significativa acerca de algún aspecto específico del rendimiento del estudiante, por ejemplo: comentarios sobre cuando el estudiante empezó en esa clase (empezó tarde), etapa de la adquisición del idioma (periodo de silencio), uso del idioma (lenguaje académico o social), condición en la que se hace la evaluación (nerviosidad inusual del estudiante durante la demostración del objetivo).

Cómo usar las rúbricas

Los procesos de clasificación y calificación fueron designados con la idea de acomodar preferencias individuales, por lo tanto, se pueden hacer de por lo menos dos formas:

1. Basado en el lenguaje que el estudiante produce (hablado o escrito), el maestro marca el descriptor que mejor representa el aprovechamiento del estudiante en la parte descriptiva de cada componente. Los descriptores marcados pueden compararse con el tiempo para una información más detallada acerca del progreso del estudiante en cada una de las destrezas; y/o

2. Después de marcar los descriptores apropiados en la descripciones de las destrezas, la maestra hace un círculo en uno de los números (del 1-5) en cada destreza que mejor represente el nivel de aprovechamiento del estudiante. (ver "Guia de calificaciones de las rúbricas" que acompaña cada rúbrica). Los números de la calificación de cada destreza pueden ser sumados (esto es opcional) y colocar el total al final de la página. Estos totales pueden ser usados cuando se quiere hacer una comparación rápida de los cambios a través del tiempo y de las evaluaciones múltiples de cada estudiante.

Cuando se haga una evaluación del nivel de aprovechamiento del estudiante, se debe tener en cuenta que los objetivos en negritas reflejan los niveles de aprovechamiento deseado al final del año escolar. En otras palabras, la maestra debe estar satisfecha si el estudiante obtiene una calificación de 3 (meta) al final del año. Se espera que las calificaciones que los estudiantes obtengan al principio del año sean más bajas.

En los casos donde la meta es 3, esto querrá decir que el estudiante está demostrando consistencia en la destreza (como en el 4to grado--Técnica Gramatical Aplicada"). Niveles de destreza más altos (niveles 4-5), serán notados si el estudiante demuestra un comando superior de la destreza (Ejemplo: se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo para la "Capacidad Expresiva") o demuestra habilidad para usar otros componentes no mencionados (ejemplo: uso de punto y coma, ortografia y formato.

Recuerde que el resultado de las calificaciones de estas rúbricas no debe reemplazar el proceso regular de calificación usado por el sistema escolar. Estas rúbricas fueron diseñadas para proveer a los maestros con medios **alternativos** de evaluación para medir el progreso del estudiante en las diferentes destrezas **sobre una base continua** con la expectativa de obtener información periódica sobre el desarrollo de las destrezas del lenguaje que pudiera ayudar a mejorar y armonizar la enseñanza en el salón de clase y el aprendizaje del estudiante.

Una nota de precaución debe darse cuando se usa la escala numérica. Para asegurarse de que la escala 1-5 sea confiable, se debe entrenar a los maestros en el uso de las mismas para que cuando califiquen tengan el mismo entendimiento del significado de los números.

Guía de calificación para usar con la escala numérica

1 -- No se aproxima a las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

2 -- Se aproxima a las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

3 -- Reúne las expectativas que se tienen como meta para ese grado al final del año escolar.

4 -- Pasa las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

5 -- Sobrepasa las metas para ese grado al final del año escolar.

Cuándo se usan las rúbricas

Las rúbricas pueden usarse en cualquier momento a través del año escolar. Se sugiere a los maestros el uso de las rúbricas por lo menos dos veces al año como una medida anterior y otra posterior que indique el progreso del estudiante. Las metas para cada nivel o grado escolar se indican claramente con letras en negrita en la descripción de cada una de las destrezas. De este modo se facilita:

1. Los planes de instrucción cuando se usa como un examen preliminar.
2. Para evaluar al estudiante cuando se usa como prueba final.

GLOSARIO

Este glosario tiene como intención clarificar la terminología usada en las rúbricas:

capacidad expresiva o fluidez: lenguaje fluido, sin interrupciones largas y con pausas naturales

componente: una parte de las destrezas

descriptor: enunciación que describe la habilidad del estudiante en uno de los componentes

estructuras gramaticales: oraciones simples o compuestas incluyendo los diferentes tipos de oraciones

expresión estructural: forma gramatical de expresar las ideas, ya sea usando oraciones simples, compuestas o complejas

expresiones idiomáticas: palabra o grupo de palabra que tienen un significado especial que no es inherente necesariamente al significado usual o de sus partes; una expresión peculiar del idioma que difiere del su significado literal

lengua materna: lenguaje adquirido en el hogar durante los tres primeros años de vida

lenguaje académico: vocabulario (términos y expresiones) usado en el contexto de la instrucción de las diferentes materias (e.g., par, impar)

palabras transitivas: términos para enlazar las ideas de un modo fluido usados usualmente al empezar una oración

rúbrica: escala de calificación usada en la evaluación de un conjunto de destrezas

técnica gramatical aplicada: uso correcto de las reglas de ortografía e incluye el formato

vocablos o estructuras complejas (gramática): uso de formas compuestas de los verbos, uso de clausulas

APPENDIX 6

Elicitation Task Matrix
for
Speaking and Writing
(English Version Only)

Arlington Alternative Assessment Project

Tasks for Eliciting Speech

Task	Acad. (A) Social (S)	Comp.	Fluency	Vocab.	Grammar

SAMPLE

Arlington Alternative Assessment Project

Tasks for Eliciting Speech

Task	Acad. (A) Social (S)	Comp.	Fluency	Vocab.	Grammar
DISCUSS DAILY NEWS	A	✓	✓	✓	✓
DEBATE	A	✓	✓	✓	✓
ACT OUT STORY OF YOUR LIFE (W/QS)	S	✓	✓	✓	✓
20 QUESTIONS	A/S	✓		✓	✓

Arlington Alternative Assessment Project

Tasks for Eliciting Writing

Task	Acad. (A) Social (S)	Comp.	Style	Sent. Form.	Usage	Mechanics

SAMPLE

Arlington Alternative Assessment Project

Tasks for Eliciting Writing

Task	Acad. (A) Social (S)	Comp.	Style	Sent. Form.	Usage	Mechanics
WRITE ABOUT A TRIP YOU WANT TO TAKE	S	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
WRITE A NEWSPAPER ARTICLE	A	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
JOURNAL WRITING	A/S	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
WRITE A THANK YOU LETTER	A/S	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

APPENDIX 7

Elicitation Tasks
for
Speaking and Writing
Grades 1-5
(English and Spanish Versions)

Arlington Public Schools - Spanish Partial-Immersion Program

TASK FORM

Type:	
Language:	
Grade:	
Time per student:	
Time for class:	
Objectives:	
Task:	

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Speaking
Language:	English
Grade:	First
Time per student:	One min.
Time for class:	As Needed

Objectives:

Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed.

Uses simple sentences.

Uses vocabulary sufficient to express basic needs and feelings; responds to simple questions, with limited or no use of first language.

Uses basic grammar; makes some errors which obscure meaning.

Tasks:

Class meeting: Discuss daily news and current events.

Book discussion: Tell about your favorite character. Discuss the ending of the story.

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Speaking
Language:	English
Grade:	Second
Time per student:	One min.
Time for class:	As Needed

Objectives:

Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed.

Speech is connected but frequently disrupted by search for correct form of expression.

Uses vocabulary sufficient to express basic needs and feelings; and retell or respond in familiar contexts with limited or no use of first language.

Uses basic grammar; makes few errors which obscure meaning.

Tasks:

Class meeting: What do you think should be our classroom rules?

Book discussion: What is the setting, main characters, plot of the story your group read?

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Speaking
Language:	English
Grade:	Third
Time per student:	10 min.
Time for class:	As needed

Objectives:

Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed.

Uses fluent connected speech, occasionally disrupted by search for correct form of expression.

Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in social and academic contexts.

Controls present tense, gender, and number agreement.

Task:

Interview students to obtain biographical information. Can develop questions to elicit the use of different tenses.

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Speaking
Language:	English
Grade:	Fourth
Time per student:	10 min.
Time for class:	As needed

Objectives:

Comprehends speech at a normal rate of speed.

Uses fluent connected speech.

Uses vocabulary sufficient to communicate in most social and academic contexts, with some varied and descriptive language.

Uses appropriate tenses, pronouns, gender and number agreement, and adjective placement.

Task:

Oral book review with discussion. Student presents a review of a book that he/she has read and then takes questions from the audience.

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Speaking
Language:	English
Grade:	Fifth
Time per student:	5 min.
Time for class:	As needed

Objectives:

Comprehends speech at varying rates of speed and in a variety of contexts.

Uses fluent connected speech.

Uses varied and descriptive language, possibly including native-like phrasing and/or idiomatic expressions.

Uses appropriate tenses, pronouns, gender and number agreement, negation, articles, prepositions, and adjective placement.

Tasks:

Explain how to do something. (Roller blade, dance, play a game/sport, ride bicycle, etc.)

Be a historical figure or character from the book and speak to the class from that perspective.

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Writing
Language:	English
Grade:	First
Time per student:	30 min.
Time for class:	30 min.

Objectives:

Writes related sentences about a specific topic.

Writes simple sentences expressing complete thoughts.

Makes correct singular/plural noun formations.

Uses correct gender formations.

Demonstrate awareness that articles and nouns should agree.

Demonstrates knowledge of sound-symbol correspondence.

Uses capital letters at beginning of sentences.

Uses capital letters with proper nouns.

Uses ending punctuation correctly.

Tasks:

Write a story about your family. Draw a picture.

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Writing
Language:	English
Grade:	Second
Time per student:	30 min.
Time for class:	30 min.

Objectives:

Develops an organized story/topic that follows a logical sequence.

Enhances writing by experimenting with details.

Experiments with different sentence structures.

Demonstrates awareness of time, gender, and number agreement.

Uses correct spelling.

Uses correct final punctuation.

Uses correct capitalization.

Uses correct formatting (e.g., indentation).

Tasks:

Write an instructive paragraph on how to get ready for school in the morning.

Describe your favorite animal.

Arlington Public Schools - Spanish Partial-Immersion Program

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Writing
Language:	English
Grade:	Third
Time per student:	40 min.
Time for class:	40 min.

Objectives:

Fully develops a story/topic with supporting details.

Enhances writing through use of details and descriptive language.

Uses different sentence structures appropriately.

Uses correct verb forms (present, past, future).

Uses correct forms of agreement (gender, number, subject-verb).

Uses correct placement (adjectives, pronouns).

Usually uses correct spelling and punctuation, capitalization, and formatting.

Task:

Describe your favorite character in a book you have read and tell why you liked that character.

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Writing
Language:	English
Grade:	Fourth
Time per student:	One hour
Time for class:	One hour

Objectives:

Develops a story/topic with appropriate use of paragraphs, supporting details, and a clear introduction and conclusion.

Enhances writing through use of voice, in addition to use of descriptive detail.

Varies type, length and structure; uses some transitions.

Uses correct verb forms (present, past, future).

Use correct forms of agreement (gender, number, subject-verb)

Uses correct placement (adjectives, pronouns).

Uses prepositions correctly.

Consistently uses correct spelling and punctuation, capitalization, and formatting.

Task:

Describe a place. Think of a cave, a castle, any city (real or imaginary), the ocean floor, another planet, or any other place. Describe it so others can see it as they read your description.

Arlington Public Schools - Spanish Partial-Immersion Program

SAMPLE TASK

Type:	Writing
Language:	English
Grade:	Fifth
Time per student:	One hour
Time for class:	One hour

Objectives:

Presents a well-organized topic that displays both depth and detail.

Demonstrates a sense of audience, in addition to use of voice and descriptive detail.

Varies sentence type, length, and structure; uses transitions appropriately.

Uses correct verb forms (present, past, future, subjunctive).

Uses correct forms of agreement (gender, number, subject-verb).

Uses correct placement (adjectives, pronouns).

Uses prepositions correctly.

Consistently uses correct spelling and punctuation, capitalization, and formatting.

Task:

Write a letter persuading a teacher, the principal, PTA, or parents that 5th graders deserve special privileges.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Oral
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Primero
Duración por estudiante:	2-3
Duración por clase:	Tiempo Necesario

Objetivos:

Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.

Se expresa en oraciones simples.

Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades básicas; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna.

Utiliza una forma gramatical básica y algunas veces incurre en errores que oscurecen la claridad de la idea expresada.

Tarea:

Reunión de la clase: "¿Cuáles deberían ser las reglas de la clase?" (Posible ideas para discutir: ¿qué haría un buen amigo?)

Cuenta un cuento matemático.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Oral
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Segundo
Duración por estudiante:	3-5 minutos
Duración por clase:	Tiempo Necesario

Objetivos:

Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.

Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que con *frecuencia* se detiene para pensar la forma de expresión correcta.

Usa un vocabulario apropiado para expresar deseos y necesidades básicas; contesta preguntas simples sin o con uso limitado de la lengua materna.

Incurre en algunos errores que oscurecen la claridad de la idea expresada.

Tarea:

Describe un experimento que hiciste en clase. Describe el procedimiento (paso por paso)

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Oral
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Tercero
Duracion por estudiante:	5 minutos
Duración por clase:	Tiempo Necesario

Objetivos:

Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.

Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente y fluido, a pesar de que en *ocasiones* se detiene para pensar la forma de expresión correcta.

Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico.

Controla el uso del presente y la concordancia del género y el número.

Tarea:

Cuenta sobre las partes más importantes de una historia o cuento que hayas leído y explica por qué te gustó.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Oral
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Cuarto
Duración por estudiante:	15-20
Duración por clase:	Tiempo Necesario

Objetivos:

Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal.

Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo.

Usa un vocabulario apropiado para comunicarse en un contexto social y académico, expresándose ocasionalmente en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado.

Usa los tiempos de los verbos, los pronombres, la concordancia del género y número y el lugar del adjetivo.

Tarea:

Entrevista a un compañero y presenta la información a la clase.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Oral
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Quinto
Duración por estudiante:	10 min.
Duración por clase:	Tiempo Necesario

Objetivos:

Comprende el lenguaje hablado a una velocidad normal y en una variedad de contextos.

Se expresa en un lenguaje congruente, fluido y completo.

Se expresa en un lenguaje descriptivo y variado que puede incluir frases y/o expresiones idiomáticas como las de un nativo.

Usa los tiempos de los verbos, los pronombres, la concordancia del género y número y el lugar del adjetivo apropiadamente.

Tarea:

Escoge un tema de las noticias y habla acerca de ese tema. Contesta preguntas relacionadas con el tema.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Escrita
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Primero
Duración por estudiante:	2-3 min.
Duración por clase:	Tiempo Necesario

Objetivos:

Escribe oraciones relacionadas sobre un tema específico.

Escribe oraciones simples que expresan ideas completas.

Uso correcto del sustantivo en singular y plural.

Uso correcto del género gramatical.

Reconoce la relación directa del artículo y el sustantivo.

Demuestra conocimiento de la relación entre símbolo y sonido.

Usa mayúscula al empezar oraciones.

Escribe los nombres propios con mayúscula.

Usa puntuación al comienzo y/o final de las oraciones correctamente.

Tarea:

Escribe una historia acerca de una amiga o un amigo. Haz un dibujo.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Escrita
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Segundo
Duración por estudiante:	30 minutos
Duración por clase:	30 minutos

Objetivos:

Desarrolla el tema narrativo o cuento siguiendo una secuencia lógica.

Realza la escritura experimentando con detalles.

Experimenta con diferentes estructuras gramaticales.

Demuestra conocimiento de la congruencia entre tiempo, género y número.

Uso correcto de la ortografía.

Uso correcto de la puntuación al comienzo y/o final de las oraciones.

Uso correcto de las mayúsculas.

Uso del formato de un párrafo (e.g., márgenes, sangrado).

Tarea:

Explica maneras de como mantenerte saludable.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Escrita
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Tercero
Duración por estudiante:	40 min.
Duración por clase:	40 min.

Objetivos:

Desarrolla completamente el tema o cuento con detalles y descripciones.

Realza la escritura a través del uso de detalles y lenguaje descriptivo.

Usa apropiadamente diferentes estructuras gramaticales.

Usa correctamente las formas de los verbos (presente, pasado, futuro).

Usa correctamente las formas de congruencia (género, número, sujeto-verbo).

Usa correctamente la posición de los adjetivos y pronombres.

Por lo general usa correctamente la ortografía, la puntuación, las mayúsculas y el formato.

Tarea:

Describe un lugar que quisieras visitar y explica por qué te gustaría ir a ese lugar.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Escrita
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Cuarto
Duración por estudiante:	1 hora
Duración por clase:	1 hora

Objetivos:

Desarrolla completamente el tema con párrafos bien organizados, detalles y con introducción y conclusión claras.

Realza la escritura usando expresiones apropiadas además de usar detalles descriptivos.

Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad; usa algunas palabras transitivas.

Usa correctamente las formas de los verbos (presente, pasado, futuro).

Usa correctamente las formas de congruencia (género, número, sujeto-verbo).

Usa correctamente la posición de los adjetivos y pronombres.

Usa correctmente los pronombres personales, directos e indirectos.

Por lo general usa correctamente la ortografía, la puntuación, las mayúsculas y el formato.

Tarea:

Escribe acerca de tu experimento favorito en ciencias. Explica lo que aprendiste.

EJEMPLO DE UNA ACTIVIDAD

Tipo:	Destreza Escrita
Idioma:	Español
Grado:	Quinto
Duración por estudiante:	40 min. a 1 hora
Duración por clase:	Una hora

Objetivos:

Desarrolla con profundidad y con detalles un tema bien organizado.

Demuestra sentido de la audiencia además de usar expresiones apropiadas y detalles descriptivos.

Usa oraciones variadas en complejidad y estructura; usa palabras transitivas con efectividad.

Usa correctamente las formas de los verbos (presente, pasado, futuro y subjuntive).

Usa correctamente las formas de congruencia (género, número, sujeto-verbo).

Usa correctamente la posición de los adjetivos.

Usa correctamente los pronombres personales, directos e indirectos.

Usa correctamente la ortografía, la puntuación, las mayúsculas y el formato consistentemente.

Tarea:

Describe una persona importante que admira y explica por qué la admiras.

Arlington Public Schools - Spanish Partial-Immersion Program

TASKS TO ELICIT ORAL LANGUAGE

Type	Tasks						
Interviews	20 questions	interview a classmate	interview a community helper	interview a person asking biographical information	do a survey		
Discussions	calendar activities	daily news/current events	book discussion	language experience-retelling	be a "person" and speak to the class	class debate	sequencing pictures and discussion
Presentations	show and tell	puddle or math problems	rhymes w/question and answer	adapt jazz chants and songs	share knowledge about exploration and experimentation	book review	advertisement
Dramatization Role playing	acting out stories/plays	take a character and act it out	act out your own story	TV show	be a reported and broadcast the news		

Arlington Public Schools - Spanish Partial-Immersion Program

WRITING TASKS

Type	Tasks					
Instructive	how to keep your teeth clean and healthy	write directions on how to...	explain ways to be healthy	caring for your pet instruction booklet	write rules for a game	compose a poster explaining how to...
Informative	research an animal	learning log	paper about the solar system	life in colonial Virginia or research paper on the life of an important Virginian	research types of plants, animals, etc.	write about your own character
Descriptive	describe an animal and its habitat	self-description	describe a character	describe your favorite book	create a character for a story or book and write about it	describe a place (ocean floor, castle, caves, city, setting, life in.., etc.)
Narrative	tell about your most recent family outing or get together	write about a trip to anywhere you want to go	write a story	write a newspaper article	write an anecdote	tell a story about a trip to anywhere you have been or would like to go
Persuasive	persuade your parents to let you have a certain pet or to...	persuade your friend to...	persuade the principal at your school to...	write a letter to a friend persuading him/her to visit you this summer	write an essay persuading people of the importance of...	
Creative	write a letter to...	write a thank you note	journal writing	write a letter to introduce yourself to a pen pal	write your opinion about...	write an ad or commercial for print or visual media

APPENDIX 8

Oral Elicitation Instrument

Grades 1-5

(English Version Only)

Oral Elicitation Instrument Guidelines

Instructions	Grade 1
Warm-Up/Conversation Goals: •social content •social functions •comprehension Try to prompt for more information (perhaps by asking "why" questions, as appropriate). Ex: Why do you like...?	Materials Needed: None Procedures: --Introduce self --Ask questions regarding: Name? Age? Family/siblings? What do you like to play? Who do you like to play with?
Picture Description Goals: •academic content •academic functions •comprehension of questions and instructions Be sure to use open-ended prompts to elicit more information as needed.	Materials Needed: •Pictures of seasons Procedures: **Phase One** --Explain directions --Lay all pictures face down --Have student choose one picture --Ask student questions about picture in order to identify the season (start with simple questions and gradually ask more complex ones) --After asking enough questions ascertain comprehension ability, "guess" at identity of picture **Phase Two** --Have student choose another picture --Look at it together --Ask student to describe picture --Ask "What else can you tell me about the season?"
Story Retelling Goals: •Mixed academic and social content •Linguistic functions related to past time narration •Comprehension of instructions Be sure to prompt for enough information to be used for speech sample.	Materials: •Four to five fairy tale picture books (no text) Procedures: --Explain directions --Student chooses a book --Student should look through whole book (sequence of events) --Student retells story
Wind-down Goals: •Smoothly end interview	Materials: None Procedures: --Ask student, "What are you going to do next? Or the rest of the day? Or after school? Or this weekend?" --Thank student and politely dismiss

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Oral Elicitation Instrument Guidelines

Instructions	Grade 2
Warm-Up/Conversation Goals: •social content •social functions •comprehension Try to prompt for more information (perhaps by asking "why" questions, as appropriate). Ex: Why do you like...?	Materials Needed: None Procedures: --Introduce self --Ask questions regarding: Name? Age? Family/siblings? What do you like to play? Who do you like to play with?
Picture Description Goals: •academic content •academic functions •comprehension of questions and instructions Be sure to use open-ended prompts to elicit more information as needed.	Materials Needed: •Pictures of seasons Procedures: **Phase One** --Explain directions --Lay all pictures face down --Have student choose one picture --Ask student questions about picture in order to identify the season (start with simple questions and gradually ask more complex ones) --After asking enough questions ascertain comprehension ability, "guess" at identity of picture **Phase Two** --Have student choose another picture --Look at it together --Ask student to describe picture --Ask "What else can you tell me about the season?"
Story Retelling Goals: •Mixed academic and social content •Linguistic functions related to past time narration •Comprehension of instructions Be sure to prompt for enough information to be used for speech sample.	Materials: •Four to five fairy tale picture books (no text) Procedures: --Explain directions --Student chooses a book --Student should look through whole book (sequence of events) --Student retells story
Wind-down Goals: •Smoothly end interview	Materials: None Procedures: --Ask student, "What are you going to do next? Or the rest of the day? Or after school? Or this weekend?" --Thank student and politely dismiss

Oral Elicitation Instrument Guidelines

Instructions	Grade 3
Warm-Up/Conversation Goals: •social and academic content •social functions •comprehension Try to prompt for more information (perhaps by asking "why" questions, as appropriate). Ex: Why do you like...?	Materials Needed: None Procedures: --Introduce self --Ask questions regarding: Name? Age? Family/siblings? What do you do in your free time? Hobbies (sports, books, games, etc.)? What's your favorite school subject? What have you enjoyed learning about recently?
Picture Description Goals: •academic content •academic functions •comprehension of questions and instructions Be sure to use open-ended prompts to elicit more information as needed.	Materials Needed: •Pictures of stages of plant growth) Procedures: **Phase One** --Explain directions --Lay all pictures face down --Have student choose one picture --Ask student questions about picture in order to identify the growth stages (start with simple questions and gradually ask more complex ones) --After asking enough questions ascertain comprehension ability, "guess" at identity of picture **Phase Two** --Have student choose another picture --Look at it together --Ask student to describe picture --Ask "What else can you tell me about how a plant grows?"
Story Retelling Goals: •Mixed academic and social content •Linguistic functions related to past time narration •Comprehension of instructions Be sure to prompt for enough information to be used for speech sample.	Materials: •Four to five picture books (no text) Procedures: --Explain directions --Student chooses a book --Student should look through whole book (sequence of events) --Student retells story
Wind-down Goals: •Prompt for future time speech •Smoothly end interview	Materials: None Procedures: --Ask student, "What are you going to do next? Or the rest of the day? Or after school? Or this weekend?" --Thank student and politely dismiss

Oral Elicitation Instrument Guidelines

Instructions	**Grade 4**
Warm-Up/Conversation Goals: •social and academic content •social functions •comprehension (including idiomatic expressions Try to prompt for more information (perhaps by asking "why" questions, as appropriate). Ex: Why do/did you like...?	Materials Needed. None Procedures: --Introduce self --Ask questions regarding: Name? Age? Family/siblings? What do you usually do after school? Have you taken a trip or vacation this summer? Last summer? What's your favorite school subject? What have you enjoyed learning about recently?
Picture Description Goals: •academic content •academic functions •comprehension of questions and instructions •comprehension of idiomatic expressions Be sure to use open-ended prompts to elicit more information as needed. Make attempt to speak naturally and use normal idiomatic expressions.	Materials Needed: •Pictures related to solar system •Picture of latest space or solar system Procedures: **Phase One** --Explain directions --Lay all pictures face down --Have student choose one picture --Ask student questions about picture in order to identify the picture (start with simple questions and gradually ask more complex ones) --After asking enough questions ascertain comprehension ability, "guess" at identity of picture **Phase Two** --Show student picture of solar system --Look at it together --Ask student to explain diagram --Ask "What else can you tell me about staying the solar system?"
Story Retelling Goals: •Mixed academic and social content •Linguistic functions related to past time narration •Comprehension of instructions Be sure to prompt for enough information to be used for speech sample	Materials: •Four to five picture books (no text) Procedures: --Explain directions --Student chooses a book --Student should look through whole book (sequence of events) --Student retells story
Wind-down Goals: •Prompt for future time speech •Prompt for subjunctive •Smoothly end interview	Materials: None Procedures: --Ask student, "What are you going to do this weekend?" --Ask student, "If you had one wish for this weekend, what would it be?" --Thank student and politely dismiss

Oral Elicitation Instrument Guidelines

Instructions	**Grade 5**
Warm-Up/Conversation Goals: •social and academic content •social functions •comprehension Try to prompt for more information (perhaps by asking "why" questions, as appropriate). Ex: Why do/did you like...?	Materials Needed: None Procedures: --Introduce self --Ask questions regarding: Name? Age? Family/siblings? What do you usually do after school? Have you taken a trip or vacation this summer? Last summer? What's your favorite school subject? What have you enjoyed learning about recently?
Picture Description Goals: •academic content •academic functions •comprehension of questions and instructions •comprehension of idiomatic expressions Be sure to use open-ended prompts to elicit more information as needed. Make attempt to speak naturally and use normal idiomatic expressions.	Materials Needed: •Pictures related to solar system •Picture of latest space or solar system Procedures: **Phase One** --Explain directions --Lay all pictures face down --Have student choose one picture --Ask student questions about picture in order to identify the picture (start with simple questions and gradually ask more complex ones) --After asking enough questions ascertain comprehension ability, "guess" at identity of picture **Phase Two** --Show student picture of solar system --Look at it together --Ask student to explain diagram --Ask "What else can you tell me about staying the solar system?"
Story Retelling Goals: •Mixed academic and social content •Linguistic functions related to past time narration •Comprehension of instructions Be sure to prompt for enough information to be used for speech sample	Materials: •Four to five picture books (no text) Procedures: --Explain directions --Student chooses a book --Student should look through whole book (sequence of events) --Student retells story
Wind-down Goals: •Prompt for future time speech •Prompt for subjunctive •Smoothly end interview	Materials: None Procedures: --Ask student, "What are you going to do this weekend?" --Ask student, "If you had one wish for this weekend, what would it be?" --Thank student and politely dismiss

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX 9

Analysis of Validity and Reliability of the Rubrics

The Pilot Study

A. Research Questions

This study represents the pilot study of the speaking and writing rubrics. When using rubrics in performance-based alternative assessments, it is critical that they clearly represent what learners can do at any given level and that they can be consistently applied by teachers. Before this pilot study, the speaking and writing rubrics had been revised many times through group discussion to better reflect curricular grade-level expectations, as well as accurately portray objectives that were below or above grade level. The pilot study was undertaken to examine how well the rubrics worked in practice. Before a set of rubrics can be used with confidence by teachers, it is essential that they are shown to be reliable; that is, that they can be applied with consistency across different testing instances and by different teachers. If they cannot be applied reliably, it is important to try to identify sources of inconsistency, and to address them appropriately.

For these rubrics, a key point is the notion of "at grade level" performance. We feel that in using these rubrics for classroom-based assessment, it is especially important for a teacher to be able to identify a skill component performance that represents the curricular objectives of a particular grade level. Therefore, the present study is motivated by the following research questions:

1. What is the reliability of the rubrics? How consistently are they applied by teachers?

2. With what consistency can the teachers use the concept of "at grade level" incorporated into the rubrics?

B. Methodology

1. Participants

Speaking: Students were drawn from classes from the three immersion elementary schools (grades 1 to 5). All raters were teachers, and with the exception of a second grade Spanish rater, all raters were members of the research team. For both English and Spanish, one rater was generally a teacher of that grade level. The Project Specialist administered the assessment and provided the other rating for each student on the Spanish rubrics. For English, a native English-speaking member of the team administered the assessment and provided a rating for each student. In general, there was a unique pair of raters for each grade.

Writing: Again, students were from classes from the three participating schools. In some cases, one rater was a grade-level teacher who was not a part of the research team. The other rater was always a research team member. There was a unique pair of raters for each grade for both English and Spanish.

2. Materials

Speaking: The pilot task, specifically designed for this research, was used to elicit a comprehensive speech sample that could be rated using all areas of the speaking rubric (see Appendix 8). Thus, the task elicited both academic and social speech, and the performance could be rated for both comprehension and for production. Although there was a basic structure to the task across the grade levels, the task was adapted to the interests, skills and abilities of the different grades. The same task was used in Spanish and English.

Writing: An English writing task was assigned in the fall to all grades as part of a county-wide assessment at two of the schools. The task in English was to describe how someone has been helpful to you. The Spanish task was the same at all three schools--to describe one's favorite animal or thing. In each language, the task assignment was slightly modified to be appropriate for each grade level.

Teachers rated the performance tasks using a field-test version of the speaking and writing rubrics in the appropriate language (Spanish or English).

3. Procedures

For most of the grades, the performance of a subsample of students was chosen to be rated for the study. Only in English writing for grades 4 and 5 did all students participate.

In order to ensure that all levels of each rubric might have a chance to be used during piloting, the subsample of students in each grade was chosen as follows. For speaking, classroom teachers were asked to divide their students into low, mid and high ability students. Then at least two students from the low and high ability and one from the mid ability range were selected to be assessed.

All students were administered the writing assessment, which was scored by a classroom teacher. To select the writing samples to receive a second rating, the project coordinator looked at the first rating in order to divide each class into low, mid and high ability students. The project coordinator then selected papers from each ability range in each grade to be scored by a second rater for the purpose of this study. The second rater was not aware of the scores awarded by the first rater.

For speaking, the students were assessed individually outside the classroom during school hours by the project specialist and a research team member. As mentioned earlier, the project specialist administered the speaking task to students for Spanish. The team member and the project specialist applied the speaking rubrics to the performance independently immediately following the performance. A native English-speaking member of the research team administered the English assessment to each student and provided one of the two ratings. When two raters were present, the performance was scored immediately. For grade 5, however, the assessment was recorded on cassette tape and scored by the second rater at a later date. The administration of the speaking task lasted between 10 and 15 minutes.

As previously mentioned, all students were administered the writing task, which they completed as a group in class. Students had about one hour to complete the task.

4. Analyses

Although the raters completed the rubrics by indicating the appropriate component descriptors and circling a number on the 1 to 5 scale, only the numeric rating was used in the analyses. The results of the double scoring were subjected to two main analyses. The first was to investigate the correlation of the total score awarded to each performance for each pair of raters. Thus, for each grade (1 to 5) and for each language (Spanish and English), the Pearson Product-Moment correlation was calculated on the total score across all components using the software SPSS for Windows (Version 6.1). This investigation was intended to give a general indication of the level of interrater agreement for each rubric.

The second analysis looked at the consistency of the application of each rubric component in each language. Because for any grade level, the number "3" was intended to signify that the performance demonstrated the achievement of that grade level's objective, the 1 to 5 rating scale was broken into three ordinal categories as follows: scores 1 and 2 were interpreted to mean "below the grade-level objective" for that component; a score of 3 was "at grade level," and 4 and 5 indicated a performance demonstrating ability "above the grade-level objective." Since this interpretation was true for any grade, the ratings were aggregated by component and not by grade for this analysis. Because it is most important to know whether a student has reached the grade-level objective or not (and for the purposes of this pilot study whether the teachers understood the grade-level goal as defined in the rubrics), we calculated the percent of all paired ratings on that component that were in complete agreement for the three groups (below, at, or above the grade-level objective). For those pairs of ratings in which there were disagreements, we calculated two percentages of disagreements: first, the percent of disagreements in regard to achieving the grade-level objective (i.e., one rater indicated the grade-level objective was not yet met, while the other indicated that it was met or even exceeded) and second, other disagreements (i.e., whether the performance was at or above the grade-level objective).

C. Results

The results of the first analysis of the pilot study data are shown in Tables 1 (Speaking) and 2 (Writing). In each table the first column indicates the grade of the students and rubric used. The second column shows the language of the assessment. The number of students with scores on each component who were assessed in each class in shown in the next column. The fourth column indicates the rater. The next two columns give descriptive statistics of the raters. The mean is the average total score awarded by the rater. The lowest possible total score was 4 for speaking and 5 for writing; the highest possible total score was 20 for speaking and 25 for writing (20 for writing for grade 1). The standard deviation of the scores awarded by the rater is given in the next column. This number is an indication of the "spread" of the scores awarded. A larger number indicates that a wider range of total scores was awarded by the rater.

The final column shows the correlation between the total scores awarded by each pair of raters. This number is an indication of the agreement between the raters. A perfect agreement would have a correlation of 1.00. No agreement would have a correlation of 0.00.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Each Pair of Raters using the Speaking Rubrics

Grade	Language	Number of Students	Rater	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation
1	English	5	1	10.00	2.83	.77
			2	12.60	2.30	
	Spanish	9	1	10.44	6.89	.99
			2	10.22	6.85	
2	English	6	1	14.17	3.13	.91
			2	13.67	3.83	
	Spanish	10	1	11.50	5.02	.97
			2	11.10	4.63	
3	English	5	1	10.60	1.14	.93
			2	11.00	1.41	
	Spanish	7	1	12.14	4.60	.98
			2	12.00	5.26	
4	English	7	1	15.29	3.55	.59
			2	15.86	3.44	
	Spanish	12	1	11.50	4.87	.97
			2	11.42	4.74	
5	English	8	1	14.75	4.27	.97
			2	15.63	4.53	
	Spanish	4	1	10.75	2.50	.87
			2	10.75	4.85	

The most important statistic in Table 1 are the correlations in the last column. The table shows that for speaking, the highest correlation between two raters was .98 for the two third grade Spanish raters. The lowest correlation was .59 for the fourth grade English raters. Correlations between the Spanish pairs were high to very high, ranging from .87 to .97. In Spanish, there was an average correlation of .96 across the five grades.

In assessing speech performances in English, three of the correlations were high (.91, .93 and .97) while two were only moderate (.77 and .59). The average correlation across the five pairs of English raters was .83, which belies the fact that for three of the pairs the correlation was quite high.

In general, the average ratings among the pairs of raters were very similar, being exactly the same for the fifth grade Spanish raters. The greatest discrepancy in average total scores is seen between the two first grade English raters. Rater two of this pair was more generous in assigning a rating (an average of 12.60) than rater one (with an average of 10.00). In general, the spread of scores awarded was similar across raters, with only one being greater than one point. For the pair of fifth grade Spanish raters, the standard deviation for rater one of this pair was 2.50 while that for rater two was much larger, at 4.85.

Of ten pairs of raters across two languages and five grades, all but two of the correlations were quite high, with seven being above .90. In this pilot study, this gives an indication that teachers who have been trained to use the oral assessment rubrics can use them with a high degree of agreement.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Each Pair of Raters using the Writing Rubrics

Grade	Language	Number of Students	Rater	Mean	Standard Deviation	Correlation
1	English	9	1	8.56	4.42	.80
			2	8.56	4.42	
	Spanish	7	1	11.86	3.13	.72
			2	9.71	2.56	
2	English	7	1	13.86	3.43	.64
			2	12.29	2.06	
	Spanish	13	1	13.00	1.73	.88
			2	11.69	2.46	
3	English	7	1	9.43	2.57	.68
			2	11.43	1.40	
	Spanish	7	1	6.43	1.13	.71
			2	8.14	2.19	
4	English	16	1	11.88	5.89	.93
			2	12.94	5.67	
	Spanish	12	1	13.17	2.86	.91
			2	13.42	3.65	
5	English	17	1	13.86	4.41	96
			2	14.24	4.48	
	Spanish	7	1	11.57	1.27	70
			2	12.00	3.92	

Again, the most important statistic in Table 2 are the correlations. In general, these correlations are lower than those for the speaking assessment. The highest correlation between two raters was .96 for the two fifth grade English raters. The lowest correlation (.64) was for the second grade English raters. There was a wide range of correlations for both groups. In Spanish, the correlations ranged from moderate (.70) to high (.91), with an average correlation of .78 across the five grades. In English, correlations ranged from .64 to .96, with an average of .80. Only four of the ten correlations were above .85, generally considered a high correlation.

For most pairs, the average ratings were very similar, though there were three differences of about two points: for the first grade Spanish raters, and both raters for grade 3. In general, the spread of scores awarded was less similar across raters than for the speaking scores. There were differences greater than one point between the raters in English grade 2, English grade 3, Spanish grade 3, and Spanish grade 5.

Of ten pairs of raters across two languages and five grades, the majority of the correlations (6) were below .85. Only three were above .90. The results of this pilot study indicate that the pilot rubrics for writing need additional revision and/or teachers need additional training in order to use the rubrics reliably.

Results of the second set of analyses, which investigated the use of the separate components and the ability of raters to agree on the "at grade-level objective" interpretation of the rubrics are shown in Table 3 (Speaking) and Table 4 (Writing).

The first column in Table 3 lists the skill component of each rubric. The second column lists the language of assessment, English or Spanish. The remaining columns show percentages of agreements between the paired ratings for that component and language across the five grade levels. The third column lists the percentage of perfect agreements between a pair of raters. This is the percentage of the total ratings for which both raters agreed that the performance was below, at, or above the grade-level objective. If there is much agreement between the raters on a component, this figure should be high. The fourth and fifth columns show the percentage of two different types of disagreements between the pairs of ratings. The fourth column shows the percent in which one rater indicated the performance was below the grade-level objective while the other rater indicated that it was at or above the grade-level objective. For these rubrics, this is perhaps the most important disagreement in that it would show disagreement in the interpretation of a grade-level performance, which forms the core of the rubrics. We want to see very low figures in this column.

The final column lists the percentage of other disagreements, which were when one rater indicated the performance was at grade level while the other indicated it was above grade level. For instructional intervention, this type of disagreement is less serious than that in which the teachers disagree about what constitutes grade-level performance.

Table 3

Agreements between Raters on Component Scores and Grade-level Objectives for Speaking

Skill Component	Language	% Absolute Agreements	% Disagreements	
			Regarding meeting grade-level objectives	Other Disagreements
Comprehension	English	69%	8%	23%
	Spanish	91%	7%	2%
Fluency	English	80%	6%	14%
	Spanish	87%	9%	4%
Vocabulary	English	67%	19%	14%
	Spanish	92%	8%	0%
Grammar	English	81%	6%	13%
	Spanish	77%	16%	7%

The results presented in Table 3 indicate that on three of the four components (Comprehension, Fluency and Vocabulary), the Spanish raters have quite a high level of absolute agreements (91%, 87% and 92% respectively). Likewise, their disagreements on the grade-level objective being met is below 10% on all three components. This indicates that the raters appear to use the rubrics to assess these components consistently across grade levels, and that there is general agreement across grade levels on what constitutes a performance at the grade-level objective. However, the application of the grammar rubric in Spanish appears to present more of a problem. Sixteen percent of the ratings were in disagreement about whether the grade-level objective was met. Nevertheless, on all four components, the average percentage of absolute agreement is 87%.

For the English rubrics, the percent of absolute agreements was generally lower across the components than for Spanish (with an average of 74%), and there was a greater percentage of disagreement between performances at the grade level and those above the grade level (column 5). However, it must be noted that for three of the components (Comprehension, Fluency and Grammar), there was a very low percentage of disagreement on what constituted a performance at grade level. Unlike the Spanish raters, the English raters appeared to have trouble applying the rubric for Vocabulary, while not having the Spanish raters' problems with Grammar.

Table 4 shows the same information for the writing rubrics.

Table 4

Agreements between Raters on Component Scores and Grade-level Objectives for Writing

Skill Component	Language	% Absolute Agreements	% Disagreements	
			Regarding meeting grade-level objectives	Other Disagreements
Composing	English	75%	16%	9%
	Spanish	80%	13%	7%
Style	English	79%	19%	2%
	Spanish	74%	15%	11%
Sentence Formation	English	70%	23%	7%
	Spanish	78%	20%	2%
Usage	English	68%	25%	7%
	Spanish	85%	11%	4%
Mechanics	English	71%	21%	8%
	Spanish	70%	17%	13%

The results presented in Table 4 contrast sharply with those of Table 3. For the writing rubrics, performance across all components is relatively uniform. Percentages of absolute agreement are much lower than for the Spanish results for speaking. The average of absolute agreements for Spanish is 77%, while for English it is 73%. (These results are closer to those for English speaking.) More importantly, all of the disagreements between performances below or at the grade-level objective are above 10%, with four of the 10 above 20%. For English, across the five components, the average percentage of disagreement on grade-level performance was 20.8%; for Spanish it was 15.2%. These results indicate that in both languages and across grades the pilot rubrics for writing need revision and/or teachers need more training to understand what constitutes performance at grade level on these various components.

D. Discussion

The pilot study has revealed important information about the rubrics and the consistency with which the raters use the concept of "at grade level." It appears that teachers are able to apply the speaking rubrics for rating Spanish speakers with a high degree of consistency. Understanding of grade-level objectives for most of the speaking components was also evidenced. This result is encouraging at this stage of the draft rubrics, as it demonstrates that it is possible to use the rubrics consistently. The use of the oral rubrics in the assessment of English speaking skills showed less consistency among the teachers, though still a high level of agreement about grade-level objectives for three of the four components. Again, this provides encouraging support for the rationale of the rubrics being centered on grade-level objectives.

The results were not as encouraging for the writing rubrics, in either language. One possible reason mentioned in group discussion during the development of the rubrics was that for writing, particularly in English, the teachers were already trained and familiar with another scoring system used in county-wide assessments. This could have made it harder for these teachers to apply these new rubrics. The concept of a "3" representing the grade-level objective rather than midway between a poor performance and an outstanding performance may have caused confusion.

Another source of confusion, particularly for the writing rubrics, may have been the "end-of-year" expectations built into the grade-level objectives in the rubrics versus the "beginning-of-year" (i.e., current) expectations to which grade-level teachers are sensitive. The pilot study was conducted in the fall, so the majority of students were below end-of-year expectations. However, they were performing as expected at the beginning of the year. It may be that some raters subtly interpreted a "3" as meeting current (i.e., beginning-of-year) expectations. This issue will need further investigation and may be overcome by additional training and practice in using the rubrics.

The results of this pilot study suggest that, for English at least, the definition of the grade-level objectives for the various components needs to be more thoroughly investigated. These findings also suggest that in both languages and across the grades, teachers need more training to understand what constitutes grade-level performances for each writing skill component.

Once the rubrics are finalized, following this pilot experience, this study should be replicated, preferably in combination with a more extensive training for the raters in both languages.